

JERSEY CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ANNUAL REPORT OF PROGRESS

2000-01 SCHOOL YEAR

Dr. Charles T. Epps, Jr.
State District Superintendent

October 2001 Revision



JERSEY CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mrs. Suzanne Mack, Chairperson
Mr. Franklin Williams, Vice Chairperson
Rev. Edward Allen
Mr. Edward Cheatham
Mr. Anthony Cucci
Mr. Terrance Curran
Mr. William De Rosa
Mrs. Willie Flood
Mr. Sergio Lamboy

Dr. Charles T. Epps, Jr., State District Superintendent of Schools
Mr. Francis X. Dooley, Deputy Superintendent
Ms. Joann Gilman, Business Administrator
Dr. Joanne Kenny, Associate Superintendent—Programs/Services
Dr. Adele Macula, Associate Superintendent—Curriculum/Instruction (PreK-8)
Mr. John Pacifico, Associate Superintendent—Division A
Mrs. Priscilla Petrosky, Associate Superintendent—Special Education
Mr. Franklin Walker, Acting Associate Superintendent—Division B
Ms. Ellen Zadroga, Executive Assistant
Dr. Nicholas A. Duva, Director—Research, Planning & Evaluation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION.....	6
SECTION I: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	8
A. BENCHMARK TABLE.....	9
B. EVALUATION OF STRATEGIES	10
STUDENT PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKS	10
School Performance Targets	10
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO SCHOOLS.....	14
Focus on Improvement in the City's Elementary & Middle Schools	14
Focus on Improvement in the City's High Schools	20
High School Task Force—New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards	24
Educational Technology Support Initiatives	27
Elementary and High School Curriculum Committees.....	30
Extended Day/Super Saturdays	31
Plan for Expansion of Implementation of World Languages	45
Continuation/Implementation of Reading Recovery Program.....	49
Alternative Education	51

HSPT/HSPA, GEPA and ESPA Staff Development	59
Corrective Action School-Level Plans.....	61
Improvement of Lowest Performing Elementary Schools	62
Staff Development Linked to Supervision	64
Administrative Staff Development.....	66
Support by Administrative Staff	68
Educational Apprentice Program	69
IMPLEMENTATION OF 6A:24	
URBAN EDUCATION REFORM REGULATIONS	70
Whole School Reform Implementation Status	70
District-Wide Whole School Reform Implementation Barriers & Issues.....	71
Implementation of Whole School Reform	85
Staff Accountability	93
SECTION II: COMPLIANCE	95
CORRECTIVE ACTION PLANS (CAPs).....	96
Attendance.....	96
Dropouts	96
State Aid	96
Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP).....	96

Overexpenditure of Funds	97
Annual Audit and Recommendations	97
Transportation Contracts	97
Health and Safety	97
Comprehensive Maintenance Plan	98
Facility Master Plan/Substandard Classrooms	98
Special Education Programs and Services.....	99
SUMMARY STUDENT BEHAVIOR INDICATORS—ATTENDANCE RATE	101
SUMMARY STUDENT BEHAVIOR INDICATORS—DROPOUT RATE	103
SECTION III: COMMUNITY AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT.....	105
Involving Parents in the Education of Their Children	106
Involving Community-Based Organizations in Support of the Delivery of a Thorough and Efficient Education	109
Strengthening and Refining the Role of the State-Operated School Board in District Policymaking.....	112
APPENDIX A: SUMMARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	113
High School Proficiency Test (HSPT).....	113
APPENDIX B: SUMMARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	119
Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA)	119
APPENDIX C: SUMMARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	123
Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment (GEPA)	123

INTRODUCTION

At year's end, when aggregate data were analyzed, HSPT scores indicated that student performance in Reading remained the same, scores dropped slightly in Mathematics, and students were performing at an all time high in Writing. District personnel have implemented measures as outlined in this report to address the weaknesses noted. Our high school results are as follows:

- In Reading, the district passing rate remained **unchanged**, bringing scores in this area 6.0 percentage points below the benchmark of 79.0%. The 2000-01 actual found that 73.0% of the students passed in this area.
- In Mathematics, the district passing rate **decreased** by 1.2 percentage points and fell 5.1 percentage points below the benchmark of 85.0%. The 2000-01 actual found that 79.9% of the students passed in this area.
- In Writing, the district passing rate **increased** by 2.6 percentage points, exceeding the State Standard of 85.0% by 2.6 percentage points and the benchmark of 85.6% by 2.0 percentage points. The 2000-01 actual found that 87.6% of the students passed in this area.

Results on the Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment are as follows:

- The district passing rate on the Language Arts Literacy section of the GEPA **decreased** by 4.6 percentage points. The 2000-01 actual found that 69.9% of the students passed in this area.
- The district passing rate on the Mathematics section of the GEPA **increased** by 10.1 percentage points. The 2000-01 actual found that 58.5% of the students passed in this area.
- The district passing rate on the Science section of the GEPA **increased** by 8.7 percentage points. The 2000-01 actual found that 56.9% of the students passed in this area.

Results on the Elementary School Proficiency Assessment are as follows:

- The district passing rate on the Language Arts Literacy section of the ESPA **increased** by 25.6 percentage points. The 2000-01 actual found that 60.0% of the students passed in this area.
- The district passing rate on the Mathematics section of the ESPA **decreased** by 6.3 percentage points. The 2000-01 actual found that 38.7% of the students passed in this area.

- The district passing rate on the Science section of the ESPA **decreased** by 0.8 percentage points. The 2000-01 actual found that 67.9% of the students passed in this area.

In the area of Student Behavior, results are as follows:

- The district met its benchmark of 93.3% in year-end student average daily attendance, resulting in what is probably the **highest three-year average attendance rate since State Takeover**: 92.0 percent!
- The percentage of students (16 years of age and older) dropping out of school **decreased** by 0.42 percentage point during the 2000-01 school year.

While the district is proud of the progress made during the 2000-01 school year, we acknowledge that there is still much work to be done. Where weaknesses have been found to exist, personnel are continually analyzing data and identifying and addressing needs. Disciplines have been focusing on teaching critical thinking and writing skills so all students receive instruction in all classes throughout the day. In addition, students were provided with a number of opportunities to enhance their performance levels with extended day classes and ESPA/GEP/HSPT Prep courses included on Super Saturdays.

This report chronicles the strides made at the 4th, 8th and 11th grades. The success of all district initiatives, as outlined in the 2000-01 Strategic Plan, is judged on each strategy's contribution towards meeting the established benchmarks for student achievement.

**SECTION I:
STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

A. BENCHMARK TABLE

Indicator		Actual 1995-96	Actual 1996-97	Actual 1997-98	Actual 1998-99	Actual 1999-00	Benchmark 2000-01	Actual 2000-01	Difference from Benchmark
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT¹	Language Arts				39.9	34.4	54.4	60.0	+5.6
	Mathematics				42.4	45.0	60.0	38.7	-21.3
	Science				66.4	68.7	71.9	67.9	-4.0
GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT²	Language Arts				76.2	74.5	76.2	69.9	-6.3
	Mathematics				48.3	48.4	61.7	58.5	-3.2
	Science					48.2	61.6	56.9	-4.7
HIGH SCHOOL PROFICIENCY TEST³	Reading	67.2	65.3	74.9	69.1	73.0	79.0	73.0	-6.0
	Mathematics	71.4	73.5	69.8	78.7	81.1	85.0	79.9	-5.1
	Writing	79.2	75.7	78.5	85.6	85.0	85.6	87.6	+2.0
STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)	Year-End Attendance Rate	89.4	91.3	91.4	89.5	93.2	93.3	93.3	0.0
	3-Year Average Attendance Rate	88.9	89.9	90.7	90.7	91.4	92.0	92.0	0.0
	Dropout Rate (16 year olds & over)	13.27	14.6*	10.0	9.3	9.92	10.0	9.5	0.5

¹1998-99 figures as reported in the May 1999 State Summary Book (Revised January 2001); 1999-00 figures as reported in the May 2000 State Summary Book (January 2001); 2000-01 figures as reported in the *Elementary School Proficiency Assessment Summary of District Performance* (Report Printed 8/06/01)

²1998-99 figures as reported in the March 1999 State Summary Book (December 1999); 1999-00 figures as reported in the March 2000 State Summary Book (January 2001); 2000-01 figures as reported in the *Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment Summary of District Performance* (June 8, 2001)

³Figures as reported by district-compiled aggregate calculations

*Figure reported at the end of the 1996-97 school year. After the report was submitted, minor changes were made & the new dropout rate became 14.93%.

= Met or Exceeded State Standard

B. EVALUATION OF STRATEGIES

STUDENT PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKS:

School Performance Targets (page 12)

- HSPT performance targets have been established in Reading, Mathematics and Writing for grade 11 through the year 2001. These targets, along with past performance at each of our high schools, can be found in Appendix A, beginning on page 113. After the first administration of the HSPA, when the State Department of Education establishes baseline data, our targets will be set. Grade 4 (ESPA) and 8 (GEPA) targets for 2000-01 can be found in Appendices B and C, beginning on page 119 and 123 respectively.
- Yearly, after final district test results are received, individual letters are sent to the principal of each school reviewing progress on student performance over the previous school year. Student performance is assessed on two distinct levels:
 - (1) Progress toward meeting the school's yearly benchmark; and,
 - (2) Progress toward meeting both the State and district standard of 85 percent passing in Reading, Mathematics and Writing in high schools and 75 percent passing in Language Arts, Mathematics and Science at elementary and middle schools.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

High School Proficiency Test (HSPT)

An analysis of student performance on the High School Proficiency Test (HSPT) indicates that:

- Students at Ferris and Snyder High Schools improved their performance in all three subject areas (Reading, Mathematics and Writing);
- Dickinson and Lincoln scores declined in Reading, Mathematics and Writing;
- Scores remain unchanged at McNair Academic High School (with a 100 percent passing rate in Reading, Mathematics and Writing);
- Reading scores remain unchanged at the district level (with 73.0 percent of our students passing);
- Math scores have declined (by 1.2 percentage points) at the district level; and,
- Writing scores have increased (by 2.6 percentage points) at the district level.

In addition, Ferris High School surpassed its 2000-01 benchmarks in Reading (by 1.6 percentage points), Math (by 2.3 percentage points), and Writing (by 7.6 percentage points), and the district surpassed its benchmark in Writing (by 2.0 percentage points).

Our efforts in the area of Reading did not result in an increase in scores on the district level. However, with the gains made at Ferris (+13.7 percentage points) and Snyder (+17.9 percentage points) this school year, we know that we are moving in a positive direction. During the 2001-02 school year, the Superintendent has directed all principals to concentrate on a Monthly Reading Project. Every school will develop its own plan, and staff will focus attention on the importance of developing good reading skills—not only in school, but also at home.

The decrease in Math scores needs to be addressed, and we will continue to intensify our efforts to improve results in this subject area during the upcoming school year. We will continue to focus on developing the students' ability to solve problems, to think critically, and to effectively communicate about mathematics in writing. Emphasis will be placed upon developing skills to answer open-ended questions related to algebra and geometry.

Writing scores, which had declined slightly (by 0.6 percentage point) during the 1999-00 school year, have increased once again. At 87.6 percent, scores in this area are now 2.6 percentage points above the State Standard. We will continue to stress the importance of improving critical thinking as it applies to critical writing.

Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment (GEPA)

Our efforts to improve student performance on a district level proved fruitful in two of the three subject areas of the GEPA. In Language Arts Literacy, the district-passing rate decreased by 4.6 percentage points and fell 6.3 percentage points below the benchmark of 76.2%. The 2000-01 actual found that 69.9% of the students had passed the Language Arts Literacy section of the test. In Mathematics, the district passing rate increased by 10.1 percentage points, and, with an actual passing rate of 58.5%, fell only 3.2 percentage points below the benchmark of 61.7%. In Science, the district-passing rate increased 8.7 percentage points, and fell only 4.7 percentage points below the benchmark of 61.6%. The 2000-01 actual found that 56.9% of the students had passed in this subject area.

Following is a summary of individual school results:

- On the Language Arts Literacy section of the GEPA, 10 of the 25 schools with 8th grade classes have improved performance from last year, and 4 have reached their benchmarks;
- On the Mathematics section of the GEPA, 20 schools have improved performance from last year and 12 have reached their benchmarks; and,
- On the Science section of the GEPA, 18 schools have improved performance from last year and 12 have reached their benchmarks.

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA)

Our efforts to improve student performance on a district level were successful in one of the three subject areas of the ESPA. In Language Arts Literacy, the district-passing rate increased by 25.6 percentage points and rose 5.6 percentage points above the benchmark of 54.4%. The 2000-01 actual found that 60.0% of the students had passed the Language Arts Literacy section of the test. In Mathematics, the district passing rate decreased by 6.3 percentage points, and, with an actual passing rate of 38.7%, fell 21.3 percentage points below the benchmark of 60.0%. In Science, the district-passing rate decreased by 0.8 percentage point, and fell only 4.0 percentage points below the benchmark of 71.9%. The 2000-01 actual found that 67.9% of the students had passed in this subject area.

Following is a summary of individual school results:

- On the Language Arts Literacy section of the ESPA, all of the 27 schools with 4th grade classes have improved performance from last year, and 20 have reached their benchmarks;
- On the Mathematics section of the ESPA, 8 schools have improved performance from last year although none have reached their benchmarks; and,
- On the Science section of the ESPA, 10 schools have improved performance from last year and 5 have reached their benchmarks.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO SCHOOLS:

Focus on Improvement in the City's Elementary & Middle Schools (page 13)

The following initiatives have been planned to raise performance levels at the City's elementary and middle schools:

- Implement one of two Whole School Reform Models (COMER and Co-NECT in the Elementary Schools and at P.S. #40- Ezra Nolan Middle School), Coalition of Essential Schools at Academy I and America's Choice at Academy II.
- Assist Cohort III schools with development of school-based budgets.
- Ensure that the district curriculum is aligned to NJCCCS.
- Expect careful test analysis on the school level and articulation with supervisors regarding specific staff development needs.
- Extend school day to provide an opportunity for students to participate in small group innovative instructional activities as an extension of the developmental program and to address deficiencies noted after careful diagnostic and interim test analysis.
- Provide the same staff development opportunities regarding instructional strategies to general education and special education teachers alike. Special education supervisors will be responsible for the same staff support as the regular education supervisors.
- Expand the Reading Recovery Program.
- Continue technology efforts of the district and develop student technology standards
- Involve guidance counselors in the development of programs and referral of students and their families to community social agencies

- Keep parents informed of students' progress and schedule appointments with the guidance counselor to sign contracts of cooperation when their children do not meet the standard for passing State assessments or are found to be "at risk" after taking diagnostic examinations.
- Encourage teacher collaboration via Professional Development Schools.
- Focus on mathematics by implementing district-required strategies to improve ESPA and GEPA performance.
 - Implement the Core Curriculum Content Standards, which, along with their cumulative progress indicators, define expectations for student learning.
 - Use the New Jersey Mathematics Curriculum Framework as a resource to provide practical guidance to implement the Mathematics Standards.
 - Develop students' ability to solve problems, communicate about mathematics, make connections within mathematics and between mathematics and other subjects and reason mathematically.
 - Familiarize students with the format of the ESPA and GEPA. Include multiple choice, short-constructed responses and open-ended questions on assessments that are administered under testing conditions. Teachers and students must be thoroughly familiar with the scoring rubrics for open-ended questions. Both teachers and students must use the scoring rubric (0-3) when assessing open-ended responses.
 - Incorporate test-taking skills and note-taking strategies where appropriate.
 - Develop students' thinking ability by asking questions that check knowledge and understanding, requesting an explanation of the thought process used (requiring analysis, prediction, evaluation and generalization) when solving problems.
 - Reflect cooperative practices in mathematics lessons so that students are given opportunities to explore and develop concepts.
 - Teach students how and when to use calculators as tools to facilitate the problem solving process.
 - Develop independent thinkers by providing students with opportunities to solve problems without being prompted by the teacher.
 - Emphasize understanding (not rote learning), applications (not abstractions), problem solving (not drill) and thinking (not recall).
 - Administer sample ESPA and GEPA
- Focus on language arts by implementing district-required strategies to improve ESPA and GEPA performance.

- Review format of the tests with teachers.
- Share activities in Language Arts Literacy Curriculum Frameworks.
- Use the New Jersey Language Arts Curriculum Framework as a resource to provide practical guidance to implement the Language Arts Standards.
- Present district strategies in reading/writing.
- Conduct grade level meetings that connect literacy with assessment.
- Review practice samples, disseminate information and give suggestions for improvement.
- Engage teachers in speculating and writing about picture prompts and analyzing poem prompts.
- Continue to develop midterm and final exams to mirror the ESPA/GEPA format.
- Disseminate the newly prepared *Language Arts Resource Guide* including framework activities and test specifications

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

All eighth graders, including Special Education and Limited English Proficient students (unless IEP or LEP exempt per State guidelines) participated in the GEPA in March 2001. The district has received the results of the GEPA. The data shared is preliminary data and is subject to change slightly as the district and State finalize the score validation process. The final GEPA 2001 scores will be presented by the State in a State Report to be published in December 2001.

The GEPA charts (found on pages 124 - 126) are offered as a presentation of district and school data available as of June 21, 2001. A preliminary analysis of district and school-level GEPA scores follows:

For 2001, as a district, the percentage of students achieving the "Proficient" (score of 200 or above) or "Advanced Proficient" (score of 250 or above) level in Language Arts was 69.9 percent. This is a 4.6 percent decrease from the 74.5 percent achieved in March 2000. The district is not satisfied with the decrease in Language Arts and will continue to intensify its efforts during the 2001-02 school year to improve those results. (See page 124.)

For 2001, as a district, the percentage of students achieving the “Proficient” (score of 200 or above) or “Advanced Proficient” (score of 250 or above) level in Mathematics was 58.5 percent. This represents a 10.1 percent increase from the 48.4 percent achieved in March 2000. (See page 125.)

For 2001, as a district, the percentage of students achieving the “Proficient” (score of 200 or above) or “Advanced Proficient” (score of 250 or above) level in Science was 56.9 percent. This represents an 8.7 percent increase from the 48.2 percent achieved in March 2000. (See page 126.)

The district is encouraged by the significant increases in Mathematics and Science and will continue to work toward increased progress in both areas for 2001-02.

In reporting the school-level data, the percentage of students achieving the “Proficient” (score of 200 or above) or “Advanced Proficient” (score of 250 or above) level in Language Arts increased in ten (10) schools. The ten schools are: P.S. Nos. 5, 6, 11, 12, 16, 24, 34, 39, 41 and Academy I.

The percentage of students achieving the “Proficient” (score of 200 or above) or “Advanced Proficient” (score of 250 or above) level in Mathematics increased in twenty (20) schools. The twenty schools are: P.S. Nos. 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 34, 37, 39, 40, 41, Academy I and Academy II.

The percentage of students achieving the “Proficient” (score of 200 or above) or “Advanced Proficient” (score of 250 or above) level in Science increased in eighteen (18) schools. The eighteen schools are: P.S. Nos. 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 22, 25, 27, 28, 34, 37, 39, 40, 41 and Academy I.

There are nine (9) schools that increased in all three subject areas (Language Arts, Mathematics and Science). The nine schools are: P.S. Nos. 5, 6, 11, 12, 16, 34, 39, 41 and Academy I. Additionally, there are seven (7) schools that increased in the two subject areas of Mathematics and Science. The seven schools are: P.S. Nos. 8, 17, 22, 25, 28, 37 and 40. P.S. No. 24 increased in Language Arts and Math. Moreover, there are five (5) schools that increased in one area: P.S. No. 9 (Science); P.S. No. 15 (Math); P.S. No. 23 (Math); P.S. No. 27 (Science); and, Academy II (Math).

In grade 4, our efforts to improve student performance on a district level were successful in one of the three subject areas of the ESPA. In Language Arts Literacy, the district-passing rate increased by 25.6 percentage points and rose 5.6 percentage points above the benchmark of 54.4%. The 2000-01 actual found that 60.0% of the students had passed the

Language Arts Literacy section of the test. In Mathematics, the district passing rate decreased by 6.3 percentage points, and, with an actual passing rate of 38.7%, fell 21.3 percentage points below the benchmark of 60.0%. In Science, the district-passing rate decreased by 0.8 percentage point, and fell only 4.0 percentage points below the benchmark of 71.9%. The 2000-01 actual found that 67.9% of the students had passed in this subject area.

Following is a summary of individual school results:

- On the Language Arts Literacy section of the ESPA, all of the 27 schools with 4th grade classes have improved performance from last year, and 20 have reached their benchmarks;
- On the Mathematics section of the ESPA, 8 schools have improved performance from last year although none have reached their benchmarks; and,
- On the Science section of the ESPA, 10 schools have improved performance from last year and 5 have reached their benchmarks.

Although we have a way to go, the district is encouraged and will continue to work toward increased progress in all three subject areas on both the GEPA and the ESPA for 2001-02. We believe that these figures show progress due to continued analysis of student performance, professional development and uniform initiatives that are being implemented throughout the district to improve student performance.

Of the many initiatives listed under *Focus on Improvement in the City's Elementary and Middle Schools* in our 2000-01 *Strategic Plan*, the following strategies to improve ESPA and GEPA performance in language arts were not implemented based on changes in the NJDOE testing program:

- Share State Department of Education training tapes.
- Extract and disseminate speaking prompts.
- Participate in scoring students' performance of the speaking portion of the test.

Successful ☐

Unsuccessful ☐

Not Implemented as Planned ☒

Explanation of Success:

Training tapes were not developed/provided by the State Department of Education.

Speaking was not part of the ESPA or GEPA this year.

Focus on Improvement in the City's High Schools (page 16)

The following initiatives have been planned to raise performance levels at the City's high schools:

- Assist schools during their Whole School Reform exploration plans to identify the model that best “fits” each high school’s particular situation.
- Teachers will implement the district curriculum for ninth graders which has been aligned to NJCCCS and the HSPA.
- Extend school day to provide an opportunity for students to participate in small group innovative instructional activities as an extension of the developmental program and to address deficiencies noted after careful diagnostic and interim test analysis.
- Monitor Extended Day classes and student attendance closely by assigning a staff member to work with head teachers and visit school sites to determine quality of the programs and numbers of students being served.
- Replicate strategies utilized in the writing lab at Ferris High School where students revised and edited their own writing across all subject areas and ensure that students who need academic support are assigned to these labs in an effort to improve their writing skills through meaningful activities.
- Expand Liberty Alternative High School to service fifty (50) 9th and fifty (50) 10th graders and expand over a 4-year period by admitting fifty (50) 9th graders per year.
- Provide ongoing staff development during the summer of 2000 and extending throughout the school year in reading, writing, math and science with special focus on ways to teach reading of all text types in all subject areas. Summer 2000 staff development opportunities include, but are not limited to:
 - *Engaging the Visual Learners: Graphic Organizers;*
 - *Engaging the Reluctant Writer;*
 - *Integration of Core Curriculum Content Standards;*
 - *Math Manipulatives;*
 - *NJSSI Summer Institute in Math;*
 - *The Geometer’s Sketchpad, Basics and Beyond;*

- *Exploring Geometry through Discovery;*
 - *Integration of Technology;*
 - *A+ For Kids Summer Science, Math and Technology Institute Conference;*
 - *New Technologies in the Science Classroom;*
 - *Great Ideas in Science K-12 Summer Workshop;*
 - *Mentoring/Professional Development Schools;*
 - *Technology training;*
 - *Whole School Reform training;*
 - *World Language Institute; and,*
 - *Early Childhood Institute.*
- Expose math teachers to the most recently approved techniques of effective math teaching through participation in classes provided by Eisenhower grant funding.
 - Provide the same staff development opportunities regarding instructional strategies to general education and special education teachers alike. Special education supervisors will be responsible for the same staff support as the regular education supervisors.
 - Provide staff development to familiarize all staff members with test specifications, rubrics, test preparation materials and effective instructional strategies.
 - Continue assignment of supervisors, who have the expertise and responsibility for the evaluation of staff, to department chairperson positions in the high schools. These supervisors replaced former chairpersons (usually the best teachers) who have been returned to classrooms, thereby placing greater emphasis on the quality of instruction. In addition to their responsibilities for observing instruction and evaluating staff, the department chairpersons also organize and present staff development workshops at the school site, as well as at conferences. They develop and distribute a monthly newsletter for all staff in their departments. This newsletter directs attention to current developments in the field, instructional strategies and techniques, gives notice of current staff development opportunities and shares the accomplishments of students and staff.
 - Continue assignment of department coordinators in the high schools. These individuals maintain a full teaching load and conduct coordinator job responsibilities before and after school or on their free time. Their responsibilities include assisting and providing materials to staff.

- Ensure and assess implementation of strategies and materials by assigning high school supervisors to classrooms at least two times a week.
- Supply teachers with reports of test analyses outlining deficiencies in their school's results on particular text types and math and writing skills.
- Continue intensive "18 Day Plan" (prior to each administration) and a "Continuation Plan" (after each administration for students who need additional academic support after the October test) in each high school in all disciplines addressing HSPT proficiencies and test taking techniques.
- Monitor (school administrators) HSPT/HSPA implementation on a daily basis.
- Provide all 9th and 10th grade students with a 1999 Prentice Hall anthology that is aligned to the NJCCCS and State assessments and continue the formal teaching of reading (which began last year) in the high schools.
- Secure signed contracts of agreement (by October 2000) from parents/guardians and 11th grade at-risk students pledging the student's participation in HSPT academic support programs.
- Schedule 9th grade students in "Extended Day" program to focus on areas of weakness based on the spring GEPA, previous year's final grades, teacher judgment and self-selection. Incoming 9th graders who did not take the GEPA in the spring will be placed in appropriate academic support classes based on teacher judgment, grades from their elementary schools and previous standardized tests.
- Mandate all at-risk 11th graders to attend HSPT Prep during one of the following: Extended Day classes, Super Saturday or HSPA Summer Institute based on the October and April HSPT 11. Failure to attend will result in the student's assignment to the SRA process during the fall 2000 semester for an extended day (after school) period with no credit.
- Post test all 9th graders in March on an HSPA practice test (The Learning Consortium) to diagnose students' strengths and weaknesses linked to Extended Day, HSPA Prep, Super Saturday, or HSPA Summer Institute Program and to assist teachers in planning for developmental classes.

- Schedule 10th graders based on the previous year's final grades, teacher judgment, self-selection and end of Grade 9 HSPA practice test to attend the "Extended Day" program to focus on areas of weakness.
- Implement measures to infuse reading across the curriculum based on analysis of test scores that have not indicated significant improvement in reading scores on the HSPT. Language arts literacy electives (with emphasis on reading) will be scheduled for all at-risk tenth and eleventh graders.
- Provide teacher training on how to help students read effectively and improve comprehension of content area subjects.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

The above initiatives have improved overall instruction in the high schools. Writing labs proved to be beneficial for students. Many students who passed the HSPT in Writing may not have passed without the support of the program. Significant amounts of workshops addressing the individual disciplines and the appropriate instructional strategies have been implemented by supervisors, school-level and district-level administrators. This, coupled with the district's focus on GEPA and HSPT/HSPA preparation, has improved instruction.

High School Task Force—New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards (page 20)

The task force proposed the following recommendations that will be continued during the 2000-2001 school year.

- A ten-credit English class incorporating public speaking and occurring in 80-minute blocks for the entire year with the same teacher will be required for all 9th and 10th graders in both general and special education classes.
- High school elective courses were analyzed to determine those which promote the Core Curriculum Content Standards and higher order thinking skills.
- English and math orientation classes and other “remedial” electives were eliminated and proficiencies are now addressed in the core curriculum classes.
- District weighting policy for summer school, magnet, honors, AP, college-level, special education, bilingual and home instruction courses will be established.
- A six-week, four-hour day, summer school program will be provided for those students who did not pass any section of the HSPT. Any 12th grader who has not passed one or more sections of the HSPT and who does not attend a summer school program will be required to take an SRA course after school for no credit.
- Appropriate college-level courses and ongoing partnerships to provide varied learning experiences outside the high school setting are being investigated.
- A high school orientation program will be conducted for all incoming 9th graders before school begins in September so that students and their parents could:
 - meet key school staff members;
 - be informed of expectations, class requirements, extracurricular options, etc.; and,
 - make necessary scheduling revisions prior to the first day of school, etc.
- Conflict Resolution/Peer Mediation strategies and techniques within the health curriculum (taught by trained physical education/health teachers) will be continued.

Successful



Unsuccessful



Explanation of Success:

The task force initiative resulted in many changes that were implemented successfully this year. Individual movement has been made to expand required and elective courses for credit as well as non-credit support courses. Additional non-credit academic support classes have been added prior to grade 9 and are being phased in for grades 9 through fifth year students. A partnership with colleges is, however, intact with colleges for students to take off-site classes. A review of current ITV procedures is underway.

Of the many initiatives listed under *High School Task Force—New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards*, the following were not fully implemented:

- Expanded required and elective course offerings for credit, as well as non-credit academic support classes will be offered during summer school, on Super Saturdays, during the evening and via ITV. The “Extended Day” program should truly become an extension of the school day, with required and elective course offerings for all students, not just those in need of academic support.
- Summer School, Super Saturdays, evening and ITV, as well as non-credit academic support classes will be offered to allow all students the opportunity to pursue coursework for a variety of reasons which may include personal satisfaction, preparation for advanced coursework, and make-up for a failed class. Course offerings would span the needs of incoming 9th graders through fifth year students. The summer program could be modeled after those offered by colleges where students can select from the offerings during a given session. Partnerships with colleges could be established to provide students the opportunity to take classes off-site for credit. This would also allow the district to present additional course offerings.
- Expanded utilization of ITV resources is planned.

Successful ☐

Unsuccessful ☐

Not Implemented as Planned ☒

Explanation of Success:

Contractual restraints and scheduling problems related to our block scheduling prevented full implementation of expanded day and ITV use for credit-bearing coursework.

Educational Technology Support Initiatives (page 23)

- Implement district and school Technology Plans based on Whole School Reform models and NJ Core Curriculum Cross-Content/Workplace Readiness Standards.
- Infuse instructional technology throughout the curriculum. Currently, all schools are networked. Each high school has a minimum of fifty (50) networked classrooms.
- Continue training through the Educational Technology Training Center (ETTC) to ensure that every professional employee receives training. Continuing education in advanced skills will be on a volunteer basis.
- Ensure adherence to instructional technology standards and use of appropriate software by grade level across the curriculum.
- Follow district policy for expanded use of ITV which will allow courses from other high schools, colleges, Liberty Science Center, etc.
- Establish seven professional development schools with a focus on technology across the curriculum

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

All schools submitted a district-approved building technology plan to the New Jersey State Department of Education as part of the Whole School Reform process. Schools are currently revising school-based budgets and will be revising the building technology plans to reflect revisions to the approved school-based budgets.

Projects linked to NJCCCS in preparation for future State assessments have been documented at the building level in lesson plans, newsletters, and project fairs. Monitoring of teachers' technology use by district supervisors/school administrators are reflected in evaluations, requests for conferences/professional development, and Professional Improvement Plans (PIPs).

Instructional technology continues to be infused throughout the curriculum. Teachers participate in curriculum integration staff development provided by the Educational Technology Training Center (ETTC). During the 2000-01 school year, approximately seven hundred fifty (750) teachers, fifty-six (56) building administrators, and eighty (80) central office personnel were given daytime in-service computer training. Approximately seven hundred (700) teachers received training by the ETTC in after-school training sessions. In addition, approximately five hundred twenty-five (525) parent and community members received technology training through the efforts of the Technology Model School and Access-Collaborative-Equity Grant programs. The percent of teachers per district at each skill level in the Use of Technology in Instruction is:

- Beginner 31 percent;
- Intermediate 46 percent;
- Advanced 16 percent; and,
- Instructor 7 percent.

The 2nd Cohort WSR Co-NECT Model schools demonstrated technology infusion at their annual Project Fair. P.S. #15 continued to utilize the services of on-site coaches to provide technology infusion activities and assistance to a group of 6th, 7th and 8th grade teachers. With the completion of installation of five hundred (500) computers in June 2001, the district will be supporting seven thousand (7000) computers—bringing its student to Multi-Media Computer ratio to 4.8 to 1. The percentage of classrooms with Internet connections is 99 percent.

The district has established instructional technology standards and implemented procurement procedures identified in the district's Business Procedures manual. The percent of schools with students using the World Wide Web on a regular basis is as follows:

- 0-30 percent of all students 10.0 percent;
- 31-80 percent of all students 62.5 percent;
- Over 80 percent of all students 25.0 percent; and,
- No response 2.5 percent.

Use of appropriate software by grade level across the curriculum is being implemented through the District Technology Plan's *MODEL FOR CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT*. All curriculum development projects require the following:

Curriculum Committee consisting of subject specialists and technology integration person;
Technology infused throughout the new curriculum document;
Staff development to communicate the contents of the new curriculum;
Revision date stated in curriculum document; and,
File available for Intranet Web Publishing.

A district policy for expanded use of ITV that allows courses from other high schools, colleges, Liberty Science Center, etc. has been established. A committee was formed to identify and communicate available courses and other distance learning opportunities. The percent of Schools with Distance Learning Capabilities is 99 percent.

The district established seven professional development schools (P.S. Nos. 5, 17, 27, 29, 30, 34 and 42) with a focus on technology across the curriculum. These schools participated in a Goals 2000 Grant with Fairleigh Dickinson University. On-site consultants trained each grade level coach on Technology Infusion activities and concepts. They turn-keyed the staff development to their grade-level teachers. Each school identified two (2) Lead Technology Coaches who, along with an ETTC trainer, received eighteen (18) graduate credits for an Instructional Technology Certificate.

Elementary and High School Curriculum Committees (page 25)

- **Revision of 5-Year Curriculum Cycle**

Elementary and high school curriculum committees by content area and K-8 and 9-12 grade-level representation convene to continue to review and revise district curriculum to NJCCCS and Cross-Content/Workplace Readiness Standards and State test specifications. Curriculum committees are now reviewing social studies and visual and performing arts since these will be the next areas to be assessed. Utilize new State Frameworks in the content areas through professional development and district curriculum implementation practices.

Conduct awareness sessions with principals at Administrators' Academy; review of curriculum alignment by supervisory staff at school-level/grade-level meetings; conduct awareness sessions with parents; and, organize school work sessions at grade level and content area meetings to discuss curriculum scope and sequence, alignment to standards, new test specifications, Core Curriculum Content Standards and Frameworks.

Successful



Unsuccessful



Explanation of Success:

The district has aligned all required courses with the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards (NJCCCS). Currently, new courses are being developed, electives continue to be revised, and curricula being revised by curriculum committees according to the district's "Five-Year Curriculum Cycle" are all being aligned with the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards (NJCCCS) and the New Jersey Cross-Content/Workforce Readiness Standards (NJCCWRS). Curriculum implementation is measured by student success on district and State assessments. School-by-school results can be found in Appendices A, B and C beginning on page 113.

Extended Day/Super Saturdays (page 27)

Extended Day

- Extend school day to provide an opportunity for students to participate in small group innovative instructional activities as an extension of the developmental program and to address deficiencies noted after careful diagnostic and interim test analysis.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

Passing rates of those high school students who attended Extended Day classes, as outlined on the following charts, indicate that the classes offered were effective in that students who would almost assuredly have failed the HSPT without this additional support did, in fact, pass at rates similar to those students who did not attend.

The following charts compare the percentage of students passing the HSPT who attended at least 90 percent of Extended Day classes (to receive credit for attendance), the percentage of students who attended less than 90 percent of the classes, and those who did not attend Extended Day classes. Students who attended Extended Day classes performed comparable to those who did not. It must be emphasized that Extended Day classes were prescribed for students in greatest need of academic support. The Extended Day classes will continue in 2001-02 as another means of academic support for students who want to improve their performance.

Of the students who attended the Extended Day GEPA Program conducted by all elementary schools, over eight hundred (800) students attended at least 90 percent of the time. Students attended their home schools for an “extended day” to receive the academic support that they need. Because of technical difficulties with our district data management system, results of our 4th grade participation in the Extended Day Program were not available at the time of this report.

HIGH SCHOOL PROFICIENCY TEST (HSPT) READING

	ATTENDED EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM						DID NOT ATTEND EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM		
	Met 90% Attendance Requirement			Did Not Meet 90% Attendance Requirement					
School	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
D.H.S.	36	14	38.9	24	10	41.7	68	31	45.6
F.H.S.	40	12	30.0	0	0	0.0	29	7	24.1
L.H.S.	57	16	28.1	31	7	22.6	4	0	0.0
M.A.H.S.	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	1	1	100.0
S.H.S.	47	9	19.1	34	6	17.6	8	4	50.0

Figures denote students tested, comparing those who attended 90 percent or more of the classes, those who attended less than 90 percent of the classes, and those that did not attend Extended Day HSPT Prep classes.

In Reading, it can be noted that, with the exception of Snyder, students who participated in the Extended Day performed comparably to those who did not. Considering that Extended Day was designed as support for the lowest performing students, these results indicate that the strategy was successful.

HIGH SCHOOL PROFICIENCY TEST (HSPT) MATHEMATICS

	ATTENDED EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM						DID NOT ATTEND EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM		
	Met 90% Attendance Requirement			Did Not Meet 90% Attendance Requirement					
School	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
D.H.S.	10	5	50.0	21	13	61.9	52	24	46.2
F.H.S.	24	5	20.8	0	0	0.0	29	5	17.2
L.H.S.	44	13	29.5	31	10	32.3	4	2	50.0
M.A.H.S.	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
S.H.S.	43	13	30.2	28	2	7.1	7	3	42.9

Figures denote students tested, comparing those who attended 90 percent or more of the classes, those who attended less than 90 percent of the classes, and those that did not attend Extended Day HSPT Prep classes.

In Mathematics, it can be noted again that participants, most of whom were identified as “at-risk,” passed at impressive rates.

HIGH SCHOOL PROFICIENCY TEST (HSPT) WRITING

	ATTENDED EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM						DID NOT ATTEND EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM		
	Met 90% Attendance Requirement			Did Not Meet 90% Attendance Requirement					
School	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
D.H.S.	8	3	37.5	2	2	100.0	41	16	39.0
F.H.S.	13	5	38.5	0	0	0.0	19	4	21.1
L.H.S.	31	5	16.1	16	2	12.5	2	1	50.0
M.A.H.S.	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
S.H.S.	24	4	16.7	15	2	13.3	7	5	71.4

Figures denote students tested, comparing those who attended 90 percent or more of the classes, those who attended less than 90 percent of the classes, and those that did not attend Extended Day HSPT Prep classes.

In Writing, it can be noted that most of the students from Lincoln and Snyder fell into the category of being required to attend and, therefore, the difference in passing rates is not surprising. For those students who passed, Extended Day provided the additional support needed.

GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA) LANGUAGE ARTS

	ATTENDED EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM						DID NOT ATTEND EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM		
	Met 90% Attendance Requirement			Did Not Meet 90% Attendance Requirement					
School	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
#3	33	27	81.8	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
#5	31	29	93.5	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
#6	1	1	100.0	0	0	0.0	73	68	93.2
#8	22	15	68.2	0	0	0.0	63	46	73.0
#9	11	7	63.6	18	12	66.7	1	1	100.0
#11	23	18	78.3	16	13	81.3	4	4	100.0
#12	5	3	60.0	16	11	68.8	1	0	0.0
#14	30	13	43.3	3	1	33.3	9	4	44.4
#15	9	3	33.3	0	0	0.0	57	11	19.3
#16	24	22	91.7	0	0	0.0	6	6	100.0
#17	64	45	70.3	11	8	72.7	3	1	33.3
#22	38	20	52.6	0	0	0.0	3	0	0.0
#23	7	4	57.1	0	0	0.0	75	63	84.0
#24	75	71	94.7	10	8	80.0	3	3	100.0
#25	75	72	96.0	10	8	80.0	7	7	100.0
#27	55	48	87.3	2	2	100.0	33	33	100.0
#28	33	29	87.9	5	4	80.0	18	14	77.8
#34	54	34	63.0	0	0	0.0	5	4	80.0
#37	54	45	83.3	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
#38	77	61	79.2	0	0	0.0	5	2	40.0
#39	8	7	87.5	7	6	85.7	19	15	78.9
#40	6	4	66.7	35	14	40.0	62	39	62.9
#41	66	33	50.0	0	0	0.0	19	9	47.4
Academy I	21	5	23.8	12	0	0.0	58	54	93.1
Academy II	18	3	16.7	0	0	0.0	62	9	14.5
TOTALS	840	619	73.7	145	87	60.0	586	393	67.1

GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA) MATHEMATICS

	ATTENDED EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM						DID NOT ATTEND EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM		
	Met 90% Attendance Requirement			Did Not Meet 90% Attendance Requirement					
School	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
#3	33	15	45.5	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
#5	31	30	96.8	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
#6	39	32	82.1	13	9	69.2	22	21	95.5
#8	16	5	31.3	0	0	0.0	69	43	62.3
#9	11	6	54.5	18	5	27.8	1	0	0.0
#11	21	16	76.2	19	15	78.9	4	4	100.0
#12	11	3	27.3	9	3	33.3	2	0	0.0
#14	29	5	17.2	5	1	20.0	8	3	37.5
#15	9	1	11.1	0	0	0.0	57	10	17.5
#16	23	18	78.3	2	1	50.0	5	4	80.0
#17	68	42	61.8	8	4	50.0	3	0	0.0
#22	38	17	44.7	0	0	0.0	3	1	33.3
#23	9	5	55.6	0	0	0.0	73	65	89.0
#24	75	57	76.0	10	6	60.0	3	1	33.3
#25	73	62	84.9	14	10	71.4	5	3	60.0
#27	57	38	66.7	1	1	100.0	32	28	87.5
#28	34	17	50.0	3	2	66.7	19	15	78.9
#34	54	34	63.0	0	0	0.0	5	4	80.0
#37	54	41	75.9	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
#38	79	45	57.0	0	0	0.0	3	0	0.0
#39	12	9	75.0	0	0	0.0	22	16	72.7
#40	4	3	75.0	28	12	42.9	71	57	80.3
#41	66	8	12.1	0	0	0.0	19	3	15.8
Academy I	21	4	19.0	14	0	0.0	58	53	91.4
Academy II	24	2	8.3	0	0	0.0	54	5	9.3
TOTALS	891	515	57.8	144	69	47.9	538	336	62.5

GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA) SCIENCE

	ATTENDED EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM						DID NOT ATTEND EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM		
	Met 90% Attendance Requirement			Did Not Meet 90% Attendance Requirement					
School	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
#3	33	13	39.4	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
#5	31	24	77.4	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
#6				Program not available					
#8				Program not available					
#9	10	8	80.0	18	6	33.3	2	1	50.0
#11				Program not available					
#12				Program not available					
#14				Program not available					
#15	25	3	12.0	0	0	0.0	41	7	17.1
#16				Program not available					
#17				Program not available					
#22				Program not available					
#23				Program not available					
#24	75	47	62.7	10	3	30.0	3	1	33.3
#25				Program not available					
#27				Program not available					
#28				Program not available					
#34				Program not available					
#37	54	36	66.7	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
#38	2	1	50.0	0	0	0.0	80	53	66.3
#39				Program not available					
#40	DATA NOT AVAILABLE AT THIS TIME								
#41	67	22	32.8	0	0	0.0	18	3	16.7
Academy I				Program not available					
Academy II	2	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	79	10	12.7
TOTALS	299	154	51.5	28	9	32.1	223	75	33.6

In analyzing the overall success of the Extended Day Program towards improving GEPA scores, it can be noted that in Language Arts, the students who attended and met the 90% attendance rate, passed the GEPA Language Arts with a higher rate of passing than those students who did not attend the program. Many students attended as required by contract because they were identified at the school level as in need of academic support. The passing rate for those who attended the Language Arts program was 73.7% as compared to 67.1% who did not. We feel that this is a commendable showing for students identified as “needing academic support” and/or “at-risk students” who may not have achieved passing grades without academic support opportunities that are offered. It must be noted that the students identified as “needing academic support” or “at-risk” may have special needs but not have been classified, or they may have recently exited bilingual programs.

In Mathematics, a much weaker area than Language Arts, the showing was also impressive. Five hundred fifteen (515) students who attended the program with a 90% attendance rate were able to achieve passing scores on the GEPA in the area of Mathematics. An additional 69 students who attended the program, but did not meet the 90% attendance rate, also were able to achieve passing scores on the GEPA. Further analysis on the school level might indicate that certain schools must monitor attendance to ensure that students attend 90 percent of the time or that their programs need strengthening in order to offer their students a better chance for success.

In Science, although there were limited programs offered, participants performed considerably better than those who did not.

Some of the district’s traditionally lowest performing schools continue to struggle to meet with success in this area. Through continued measures to address low performing schools and through the implementation of Whole School Reform efforts, some of their unique needs may be met.

In analyzing passing rates of students who attended and did not attend Extended Day Programs with a 90% attendance rate, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- Some schools had more students attend on a regular basis (90% of the time) during the 2000-01 school year. Several schools had a majority who did not attend. Guidance counselors and head teachers should have been more aggressive in ensuring participation of students who did not participate and in tracking attendance to keep students in the program. Some students who did not attend may have benefited from attendance in the programs.
- Percent passing who attended the Extended Day Program must be viewed with caution when few students attended.

- Students who attended, in many cases, were those who attended by contract (at-risk students). Many who passed may not have passed without the support of the program.

Super Saturdays

- Implement a “Super Saturday Program” at five elementary schools and one high school, available to all district students (based on projected enrollments). Low staff/student ratio will provide for individualization of instruction.

(Partially) Successful



Unsuccessful



Explanation of Success:

A very low number of students took advantage of this option for HSPT preparation. Therefore, it must be concluded that Super Saturdays HSPT Preparation Programs are not attractive to students and should not be continued.

The following charts compare the percentage of students passing State assessments who attended Super Saturdays classes and those who did not attend Super Saturdays classes. Because of technical difficulties with our district data management system, results of our 4th grade participation in the Super Saturdays Program were not available at the time of this report.

HIGH SCHOOL PROFICIENCY TEST (HSPT) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

	ATTENDED SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM						DID NOT ATTEND SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM		
	Met 70% Attendance Requirement			Did Not Meet 70% Attendance Requirement					
School	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
D.H.S.	0 of 0	0	0.0	0 of 0	0	0.0	128	55	43.0
F.H.S.	2 of 2	0	0.0	1 of 6	1	100.0	66	18	27.3
L.H.S.	0 of 2	0	0.0	2 of 11	1	50.0	90	22	24.4
M.A.H.S.	1 of 1	1	100.0	0 of 0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
S.H.S.	0 of 0	0	0.0	0 of 0	0	0.0	89	19	21.3

#Tested (Met 70% Attendance Requirement) refers to the number of students tested of the number who attended this program with a 70% or better attendance rate. For example, at Lincoln High School, 2 students attended the program regularly, but neither took the HSPT in April.

Tested (Did Not Meet 70% Attendance Requirement) refers to the number of students tested of the number who attended this program with less than a 70% attendance rate. For example, at Lincoln High School, 11 students attended the program with less than a 70% attendance rate. Of those 11 students, only 2 took the HSPT in April.

#Tested (Did Not Attend Super Saturdays Program) refers to the number of students who were tested in April (did not pass in October 2000) and did not attend the Super Saturdays HSPT Prep classes.

HIGH SCHOOL PROFICIENCY TEST (HSPT) MATHEMATICS

	ATTENDED SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM						DID NOT ATTEND SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM		
	Met 70% Attendance Requirement			Did Not Meet 70% Attendance Requirement					
School	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
D.H.S.	0 of 0	0	0.0	0 of 0	0	0.0	83	42	50.6
F.H.S.	0 of 1	0	0.0	1 of 5	0	0.0	52	10	19.2
L.H.S.	0 of 2	0	0.0	1 of 8	0	0.0	78	25	32.1
M.A.H.S.	0 of 0	0	0.0	0 of 0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
S.H.S.	0 of 0	0	0.0	0 of 0	0	0.0	78	18	23.1

#Tested (Met 70% Attendance Requirement) refers to the number of students tested of the number who attended this program with a 70% or better attendance rate. For example, at Lincoln High School, 2 students attended the program regularly, but neither took the HSPT in April.

Tested (Did Not Meet 70% Attendance Requirement) refers to the number of students tested of the number who attended this program with less than a 70% attendance rate. For example, at Lincoln High School, 8 students attended the program with less than a 70% attendance rate. Of those 8 students, only 1 took the HSPT in April.

#Tested (Did Not Attend Super Saturdays Program) refers to the number of students who were tested in April (did not pass in October 2000) and did not attend the Super Saturdays HSPT Prep classes.

**GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA)
LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY**

	ATTENDED SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM						DID NOT ATTEND SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM		
	Met 70% Attendance Requirement			Did Not Meet 70% Attendance Requirement					
School	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
#5	13	11	84.6	6	6	100.0	12	12	100.0
#8	16	13	81.3	0	0	0.0	69	48	69.6
#11	1	1	100.0	1	0	0.0	41	34	82.9
#16	5	5	100.0	0	0	0.0	25	23	92.0
#23	8	6	75.0	1	1	100.0	73	60	82.2
#24	2	2	100.0	1	1	100.0	85	79	92.9
#27	6	6	100.0	0	0	0.0	84	77	91.7
#28	1	1	100.0	0	0	0.0	55	46	83.6
#34	3	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	56	38	67.9
#38	1	1	100.0	0	0	0.0	81	62	76.5
#39	12	10	83.3	0	0	0.0	22	18	81.8
#40	1	1	100.0	10	9	90.0	92	47	51.1
Academy I	0	0	0.0	1	0	0.0	90	59	65.6
Academy II	2	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	78	12	15.4
TOTALS	71	57	80.3	20	17	85.0	863	615	71.3

GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA) MATHEMATICS

	ATTENDED SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM						DID NOT ATTEND SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM		
	Met 70% Attendance Requirement			Did Not Meet 70% Attendance Requirement					
School	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
#3	2	1	50.0	0	0	0.0	31	14	45.2
#5	5	5	100.0	6	5	83.3	20	20	100.0
#9	0	0	0.0	1	0	0.0	29	11	37.9
#11	1	1	100.0	0	0	0.0	43	34	79.1
#15	2	1	50.0	0	0	0.0	64	10	15.6
#16	5	4	80.0	0	0	0.0	25	19	76.0
#23	15	12	80.0	1	1	100.0	66	57	86.4
#24	5	2	40.0	1	0	0.0	82	62	75.6
#27	5	3	60.0	0	0	0.0	85	64	75.3
#28	1	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	55	34	61.8
#34	4	4	100.0	0	0	0.0	55	34	61.8
#38	2	1	50.0	0	0	0.0	80	44	55.0
#39	10	6	60.0	0	0	0.0	24	19	79.2
#40	7	7	100.0	8	4	50.0	88	61	69.3
Academy I	0	0	0.0	1	0	0.0	92	57	62.0
Academy II	1	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	77	7	9.1
TOTALS	65	47	72.3	18	10	55.6	916	547	59.7

Although 4th and 8th grade students identified as “in need of academic support” or “at-risk” were offered the option of attending the Super Saturdays Program as part of their contract, the majority did not choose this option. One could conclude, based on the numbers in the charts, that the majority of students chose to attend their school’s Extended Day Program instead.

Of the 71 eighth grade students who attended the Super Saturdays Language Arts Institute with a 70% attendance rate, 57 students (or 80.3%) achieved the proficient level on the GEPA Language Arts Literacy section of the test. An analysis of the attendance data from the Super Saturdays Program indicated that students who took the GEPA Language Arts course attended from 14 (noted in chart) of the 25 schools and only 71 attended at least 70% of the time.

Of the 65 eighth grade students who attended the Super Saturdays Mathematics Institute with a 70% attendance rate, 47 students (or 72.3%) achieved the proficient level on the GEPA Mathematics section of the test. An analysis of the attendance data from the Super Saturdays Program indicated that students who took the GEPA Mathematics course attended from 16 (noted in chart) of the 25 schools and only 65 attended at least 70% of the time.

The primary focus of the Super Saturdays Program continues to center on the achievement of the NJ Core Curriculum Content Standards by offering students unique, high-quality performance-based classes focusing on higher order thinking skills. The success of Super Saturdays has been unprecedented for the past four years, and the program has been awarded numerous national and State awards, including a “Best Practice Award” in the area of Demonstrably Effective Programs. The ESPA and GEPA institutes provided as part of the Super Saturdays Program continue to focus on providing students with another opportunity for practice and success. Due to the limited schedule of Super Saturdays (10 weeks for 75 minutes per class), predicting student performance on the GEPA or ESPA solely based on this opportunity is less than fair. It is intended as an “additional support activity.”

Plan for Expansion of Implementation of World Languages (page 28)

- Expand World Languages instruction to grades four and seven. Include: continuation of a World Language Task Force; recruitment of additional teachers; development of curriculum; purchase of materials; and, training of teachers during the school year and during a summer institute.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

The World Languages Program (Spanish), begun in 1998-99, was expanded to grades 3 and 6 during the 1999-00 school year and to grades 4 and 7 during the 2000-01 school year. The tables on pages 47 and 48 outline student performance as noted on final report cards.

Report card grades for regular education students show:

- Of 2063 second graders, 1653 (or 80%) scored 3 and 4—the highest grades.
- Of 2121 third graders, 2043 (or 96%) were successful in passing this subject.
- Of 2367 fourth graders, 2258 (or 95%) were successful in passing this subject.
- Of 2064 fifth graders, 1987 (or 96%) were successful in passing this subject.
- Of 2310 sixth graders, 2224 (or 96%) were successful in passing this subject.
- Of 2095 seventh graders, 1954 (or 93%) were successful in passing this subject.
- **Of 13020 regular education students receiving instruction, 12119 (or 93%) were successful in passing this subject.**

Report card grades for special education students show:

- Of 138 second graders, 87 (or 63%) scored 3 and 4—the highest grades.
- Of 213 third graders, 196 (or 92%) were successful in passing this subject.
- Of 171 fourth graders, 165 (or 96%) were successful in passing this subject.
- Of 269 fifth graders, 253 (or 94%) were successful in passing this subject.
- Of 133 sixth graders, 125 (or 94%) were successful in passing this subject.
- Of 210 seventh graders, 204 (or 97%) were successful in passing this subject.
- **Of 1134 special education students receiving instruction, 1030 (or 91%) were successful in passing this subject.**

WORLD LANGUAGES - Report Card Grades - Regular Ed.

SCHOOL	GRADE 2				GRADE 3					GRADE 4					GRADE 5					GRADE 6					GRADE 7				
	1	2	3	4	F	C	C+	B	A	F	C	C+	B	A	F	C	C+	B	A	F	C	C+	B	A	F	C	C+	B	A
P.S. #1	N/A BILINGUAL MAGNET																												
P.S. #3	0	22	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	32	0	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	35	0	0	0
P.S. #5	0	0	15	12	0	1	11	47	15	0	0	5	41	16	0	0	2	33	8	0	0	3	23	15	0	0	4	25	18
P.S. #6	0	4	33	52	0	4	6	63	17	0	9	1	34	59	2	19	9	27	81	0	12	6	85	9	2	11	4	11	13
P.S. #8	5	19	25	49	3	13	14	18	37	0	1	2	95	32	6	16	10	38	49	5	15	23	47	20	0	12	0	58	30
P.S. #9	0	4	31	21	0	0	2	36	9	0	0	0	15	39	0	11	3	23	20	0	6	0	35	4	3	9	0	11	7
P.S. #11	0	12	48	28	0	24	0	33	19	0	4	0	61	14	0	21	6	36	37	0	16	4	23	29	0	23	9	20	10
P.S. #12	Teacher on Leave				0	4	10	28	10	Teacher on Leave																			
P.S. #14	0	56	10	8	5	22	0	15	8	3	42	0	10	6	8	34	1	10	10	3	19	3	24	17	Teacher Vacancy				
P.S. #15	5	34	21	12	0	0	48	37	12	4	40	1	30	10	13	45	0	16	15	2	10	11	33	23	12	15	15	33	11
P.S. #16	0	7	0	12	0	11	4	9	9	0	5	6	12	16	0	3	2	7	19	0	0	2	5	9	0	0	0	6	23
P.S. #17	2	17	46	70	9	19	20	48	36	10	15	20	74	27	0	3	5	52	28	4	20	27	54	6	8	20	23	39	13
P.S. #20	16	26	30	3	13	11	16	31	10	8	4	7	11	9	15	5	12	27	16										
P.S. #22	0	7	24	33	1	5	8	9	35	4	7	5	25	28	1	0	1	1	1	9	11	15	26	14	4	5	8	26	14
P.S. #23	0	7	29	69	0	18	7	30	77	0	0	33	57	71	0	21	0	58	64	0	17	22	42	36	0	16	2	37	38
P.S. #24	1	4	24	45	5	22	17	33	40	0	12	4	33	42	1	13	2	44	61	10	22	11	37	41	4	13	2	49	38
P.S. #25	0	11	88	13	Teacher Resigned					0	22	7	38	5	4	2	30	71	34	5	26	36	30	18	6	29	39	39	14
P.S. #27	2	26	54	37	1	30	4	40	60	12	34	18	44	15	1	20	5	45	51	6	41	26	45	1	13	24	24	31	1
P.S. #28	0	0	28	53	0	5	1	46	55	1	0	16	42	29	0	1	0	44	49	0	15	2	47	52	0	0	20	22	52
P.S. #29	13	10	19	19	0	13	11	16	17	0	18	4	3	16															
P.S. #30	3	14	0	22	3	30	0	41	28	1	7	0	34	35	2	3	10	29	44										
P.S. #33	N/A																												
P.S. #34	4	4	4	16	4	2	1	14	25	25	17	5	22	89	Teacher Vacancy					17	25	7	22	57	15	19	0	20	38
P.S. #37	0	1	22	55	0	7	3	28	31	0	0	1	6	53	Teacher Vacancy														
P.S. #38	13	58	191	208	30	34	22	90	184	36	46	30	124	212	17	24	31	87	199	18	20	42	124	218	62	30	68	135	242
P.S. #39	Teacher Resigned									5	11	9	34	3	3	3	10	23	7	2	15	12	24	5	2	13	7	15	6
P.S. #40																				5	44	31	69	9	0	39	1	69	28
P.S. #41	1	2	35	39	4	8	9	30	30	0	18	7	31	31	4	17	7	37	39	0	1	9	61	38	10	29	15	9	15
P.S. #42	Teacher Resigned																												
Acad. I																				0	2	2	18	59	0	10	6	14	75
Acad. II																								Teacher Vacancy					
TOTALS:	65	345	777	876	78	323	214	742	764	109	344	181	876	857	77	301	146	708	832	86	376	294	874	680	141	352	247	669	686

WORLD LANGUAGES - Report Card Grades - Special Education

SCHOOL	GRADE 2				GRADE 3					GRADE 4					GRADE 5					GRADE 6					GRADE 7					
	1	2	3	4	F	C	C+	B	A	F	C	C+	B	A	F	C	C+	B	A	F	C	C+	B	A	F	C	C+	B	A	
P.S. #1	N/A		BILINGUAL MAGNET																											
P.S. #3	0	10	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
P.S. #5															0	0	1	4	3	0	0	2	4	2	0	3	4	3	0	0
P.S. #6	0	0	4	7	0	9	7	11	1						0	3	2	6	5	0	9	3	6	1	0	8	2	5	6	6
P.S. #8	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1						
P.S. #9					0	0	0	11	13	0	2	2	17	16	0	0	1	10	1	0	1	2	9	2	0	2	2	20	26	26
P.S. #11															0	7	0	3	0											
P.S. #12																														
P.S. #14																														
P.S. #15																														
P.S. #16					0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	1	1
P.S. #17					2	2	0	4	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4	2	3	1	2	4	2	2	3	10	1	1
P.S. #20	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	0						1	2	0	2	0											
P.S. #22	3	4	9	9	8	6	2	11	8	4	3	2	6	3	13	5	18	18	16	0	0	1	6	4						
P.S. #23	0	1	3	10	0	0	6	7	3																0	0	2	6	6	
P.S. #24	1	3	2	0	0	6	0	4	0	0	1	1	6	0	0	4	6	10	11	0	1	8	3	0	3	2	1	3	1	
P.S. #25	0	2	3	1						0	0	0	1	0	0	8	6	3	0	0	1	5	2	0	0	3	9	2	0	0
P.S. #27	1	4	1	0																										
P.S. #28	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3	0	13	4	0	12	0	11	6	0	0	0	1	0						
P.S. #29	8	6	10	9																										
P.S. #30	1	4	0	7	1	1	0	7	4	2	6	7	0	0																
P.S. #33																														
P.S. #34																														
P.S. #37																														
P.S. #38																														
P.S. #39					5	1	1	3	0	0	7	7	14	0																
P.S. #40																				6	5	1	1	0	1	10	1	6	0	0
P.S. #41					0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	9	5	2	3	2	1	4						0	1	3	8	1	1
P.S. #42																														
Academy I	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	16	10	0	0	0	15	5	0	0	2	19	10	0	0	2	10	10	0	0	1	29	8	8
Academy II																														
TOTALS:	14	37	38	49	17	31	18	86	61	6	25	20	84	36	16	52	40	100	61	8	29	25	45	26	6	34	28	92	50	50

Continuation/Implementation of Reading Recovery Program (page 29)

- Fifty-eight (58) Reading Recovery teachers are assigned to address the needs of the elementary schools.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

Reading Recovery teachers are assigned to each of the elementary and primary schools in the district. The Reading Recovery teachers are committed to servicing the lowest performing twenty percent achievers of the first grade students. Throughout the school year, these teachers instructed 558 (or 24.6%) of the 2,264 first grade students enrolled in the Jersey City Public Schools.

Preliminary data indicates that 278 (or 49.8%) of the students serviced have met the rigorous criteria for successfully completing the program. Successful exiting of the program indicates that the child can engage in, and successfully profit from, classroom literacy instruction without individual tutoring. In essence, the child exits the program at or very near grade level.

Of the 558 students serviced, 341 (or 61%) were promoted to the second grade. Data from the school district's Reading Recovery follow-up studies allow us to predict that the majority of these children will maintain these early gains through grade 3.

Jersey City's Reading Recovery Site Report (1999-00), which was compiled in the fall of 2000, indicates that Successfully Discontinued students scored higher on all six Observation Survey tasks than the Random Sample students. The data indicated that Successfully Discontinued students also scored higher than the Random Sample and Other Comparison Group students on the site average band of text reading. An impressive 100% of the Successfully Discontinued students scored within or above this band. Children who were Successfully Discontinued during the school year continued to show

progress without the individualized intervention. This proved that they had developed a self-extending system. The issue of incomplete programs for children was alleviated in part through the use of the summer school program. Eighteen additional students were able to meet the criteria needed to successfully discontinue. A follow-up study showed that second and third grade Reading Recovery graduates were performing at or near grade level. On text reading, they scored higher than the district average.

Jersey City's Reading Recovery Site Report for the 2000-01 school year will be compiled during the fall of 2001.

Alternative Education (page 30)

- Continue implementation and expansion of our alternative education programs and strategies to address the needs of the at-risk population in the Jersey City Public Schools. These programs will include: Academy I; Academy II; Zero Tolerance Alternative Programs, “*Better Choices*” and “*fifteen together*,” and other Zero Tolerance Alternative Programs in grades K-5 and 6-12.
- Form a Parent Advisory Group for the 2000-2001 school year for the *fifteen together* program comprised of thirteen (13) parents representing every high school. Community-based organizations where students were assigned to work during the summer met with parents prior to start date.
- Implement PACE Program with special education students who may be at risk of dropping out as an educational summer program and freshman mentorship high school program. Graduating grade 8 special needs students will meet with present freshman students to participate in a paid summer educational experience and an extended day after-school experience in the fall 2000.
- Offer an interim inclusive alternative educational setting for students whose educational program is being addressed by the CST because of their involvement in Zero Tolerance infractions. This will assist in minimizing students on home instruction. To deal with Zero Tolerance population, it was suggested that students be evaluated before returning to regular buildings. A task force looked at Zero Tolerance during the 1999-2000 school year. As a result, another CST and an art therapist will be hired to work with students in Zero Tolerance and “*Better Choices*” programs. Teachers and teacher assistants will serve groups no larger than 8 students.
- Zero Tolerance and “*Better Choices*” staff, along with CSTs, will be attending training to help them deal with their students on a daily basis
- Expand Liberty Alternative High School to service fifty (50) 9th graders and fifty (50) 10th graders until 200 students are accepted over a 4-year period.

Successful



Unsuccessful



Explanation of Success:

“Zero Tolerance”

On February 17, 1998, a new “zero tolerance” policy on weapons and violence was implemented in our district. “Zero tolerance” means that those students who carry a weapon to school or use any item on their person as a weapon to threaten or harm another student or teacher will be immediately removed from the school. In addition, those students who commit any violent acts against a teacher or another student in school, on the school grounds or on the school buses, will be immediately removed from the school building. Removal from school does not mean suspension from school. It means placement in an alternate facility for a minimum of two weeks up to a year, depending upon the severity of the offense. At the Boys/Girls’ Club and P.S. 29 Annex, district Zero Tolerance sites, students stay an average of 10 days.

Teachers remind students and parents of this policy, and parents are encouraged to talk to their children about it. The district will not tolerate any weapons in school or any violent acts committed against any of our students or teachers.

For the 2000-01 school year, an art therapist has been added to the program. Her work involves dealing with conflict resolution and anger management through art. In addition, an alternative class has been added for students who have been assigned to “zero tolerance” and were recommended for out-of-district placement. Students remain in this class (rather than return to their home school) until their placement has been finalized.

Better Choices

The Better Choices Alternative Education Intervention Program at the Bentley Avenue Learning Center is designed to meet the needs of students who are between the ages of 12-17 years and have demonstrated that the traditional middle/high school setting is not meeting their needs. It was implemented in September 1999. Most of the students are in the middle grades, though they are usually older than their counterparts, having been retained in grade at least once. In the judgment of their teachers and counselors, their academic careers, to this point, are nearly at a standstill because of their lack of essential skills in academics and decision-making.

The program's goals are to offer an alternative education program that successfully addresses the emotional and social needs of the students through short-term intervention and assisting students to recognize and begin to change unproductive and provocative patterns of behavior in school while promoting academic success.

The Better Choices Alternative Middle School is designed to provide a short-term intervention to help meet the social and academic needs of students who are not performing successfully in the traditional middle school setting. This program will give those students a chance to improve upon their previous academic and behavioral performance and begin the preparation for the transition into high school.

Students may attend the Better Choices Program for no more than one entire marking period. During the 2000-01 school year, one hundred eleven (111) students attended for more than two weeks.

Academy I and Academy II

Academy I and Academy II implemented their Whole School Reform programs this year. After a full year of intensive staff development, school administrators are optimistic about the benefits their chosen programs (Coalition of Essential Schools at Academy I and America's Choice at Academy II) will have on student achievement. The large number of at-risk students enrolled at each of these schools requires innovative and non-traditional instructional strategies that the staff are now better prepared to implement.

"Fifteen together"

Now in its fourth year of implementation, *"fifteen together"* is a district-wide initiative that identifies at-risk eighth graders who are potential dropouts and offers them the opportunity to enroll in a program that provides extensive counseling and support—beyond the realm of the regular school curriculum. This is accomplished by assigning students to a mentor/counselor and peer leader who works closely with them and their families for a two-year period designed to help them overcome the obstacles and barriers that impede their academic success.

During the 2000-01 school year, one hundred fifty (150) special needs students were included in this program under the umbrella of PACE.

The first phase of this project begins with a six-week summer program. Incoming 9th graders attend a daily, four-hour session at their home high school. They are taught the "Overcoming Obstacles" curriculum (a special program designed

to meet the needs of at-risk youth). They are acclimated to the high school they are attending, to help them to be in comfortable surroundings when they enter school in September. They are also acquainted with a number of teachers and students who will be there to greet them when school begins in the fall—further adding to their comfort level.

Incoming 10th graders (now in the second year of the program) attend their respective high schools for a few hours a week in order to learn interview techniques and related job skills. The majority of the week is spent working at community-based agencies throughout the city where students receive hands-on work experience. The mentor/counselors and peer leaders continue to work with both cohorts throughout the school year—meeting with students on an individual and group basis, calling their homes (when necessary), and collaborating with their recitation teachers.

The district has determined that a Parent Advisory Group, representing every high school, is an extremely important asset to the success of the *“fifteen together”* program. A group comprised of thirteen (13) parents was, therefore, formed during the 2000-01 school year. Parent participation in *“fifteen together”* events/activities sends an important message to staff and students that parents are an integral part of a student’s success!

This mission is extremely important to our students. It is also very important that students are aware of the attendance policy, the value of attending school on a daily basis, and the consequences of such if they do not. Progress reports help monitor these students and correct any deficiencies in a timely fashion.

The following facts were extracted from our **District Analysis—*fifteen together*** (Cohorts I, II and III), available through the Office of Programs/Services:

- Cohort I began in July 1998 with 333 students participating in the program. In June 2000, 213 of the Cohort I students had completed the program and passed three (3) sections of the HSPT. Today we are currently monitoring 176 students. Fifty-two percent (52%) of these students will be full seniors.
- Cohort II began in July 1999 with 331 students participating in the program. At this time there are 265 students actively participating in meetings and activities.
- Cohort III began in July 2000 with 452 students participating in the program. At this time there are 354 students actively participating in meetings and activities.

Liberty Alternative High School

The following information was taken from *Liberty High School—First Year Report, June 2000*, the alternative high school mentioned above which opened in the fall of 1999. Included in the *Report* is a press release conducted by the Bank Street College of Education, which concludes that smaller schools produce better results than larger schools in key areas related to student success:

- They are safer. There is less violence and less vandalism.
- Student attendance is better.
- There are fewer dropouts.
- More students pass their subjects.
- Test scores are generally higher than those of comparable students in larger schools.

The *Report* from Liberty High School bears out these claims.

Violence:

During Liberty's second year, with double the student population, there were a total of seven (7) fights up to mid-June. Three (3) took place inside the school building. In no case were weapons used, and there was no significant physical damage to any student or property. All students who fought were suspended each time. There were three repeat offenders. Positive parental involvement helped to prevent continuation of quarrels.

Suspensions for All Reasons:

Up to mid-June, twenty-three (23) individuals were suspended once, four (4) twice, and six (6) more than twice. Fifteen (15) suspensions were for fighting; all others were for such causes as interfering with the progress of a class, excessive absence or lateness.

Vandalism:

There was one (1) incident of graffiti in the building. It is not clear whether this was done by a high school student, a college student or a visitor. Student work was displayed regularly throughout the year in classrooms, in the cafeteria and

in the hallways. None was ever damaged or defaced. There were no occasions of deliberate damage to the fabric, furnishings or equipment of the school.

Student Attendance:

Student attendance remained good. As of mid-June, attendance averaged 92 percent for the year. As several students complained, they had no chance to be absent without its being reported to their parents: the family of every student who was absent received a call each time he/she was absent. The families of students who came late got phone calls as well.

Dropout Rate:

There was one dropout, a student who was unable to manage childcare issues and maintain attendance. Three students transferred back to their zoned schools and moved out of the district.

If there are dropouts at the end of the semester, it is anticipated that they will be from the cohort who entered Liberty in the second year, after having a negative experience in their first year or years of high school.

Curriculum:

All students studied a curriculum that included the following:

- Freshman and sophomore English;
- Pre-Algebra, Algebra I and Geometry; World History & Cultures, and US History I;
- Biology;
- Computer Business Application, Computer Research, and Computer Art;
- Career Education and Personal Finance;
- Health, and Physical Education I and II.

All students in danger of failing were given summer school applications; they and their parents were counseled regarding the need to attend summer school in order to keep on track for on-time graduation. At this time, we have no information regarding the number of students who will attend.

Unique Opportunities Offered Through Partnership with Hudson County Community College:

- College classes were held in the building in the late afternoon and evening. As Liberty's enrollment grows, there are no free rooms during regular school hours. We are trying to arrange a room exchange next year, so that a class or classes can be held on the main campus.
- College tutors were not available this year, because of funding and programming considerations. However, college students were employed in the building as part of work-study programs, and formed relationships with, and served as role models to many high school students.
- All Liberty students carry college, as well as high school IDs and are eligible to use the college library and computer lab. Liberty classes regularly used the college computer lab, where they were made welcome and got excellent assistance from the college staff.
- Fifteen (15) students took college courses at Hudson County Community College (College Survival Skills and Basic Math). Grades are not yet available.

Passing Rate in Courses:

Final grades have not yet been given.

Extracurricular Activities Available to Students and Extent of Participation:

The Extended Day Program offered the following:

- A Helping Hand (social action club)
- Computer Club
- Drama Club
- Math, Science tutoring
- Newspaper
- Salsa Club (Latin culture)

- Strategies for Success (tutoring in all subjects)
- Student Government
- Wall Street Club

Registration for 2001-02:

Fifty (50) students are expected to complete the 9th grade and thirty-nine (39) to complete grade 10. As of this time, forty-eight (48) students have been accepted into the entering freshman class for 2001-02, and there is a long waiting list of applicants for each grade.

Twilight Program

The Jersey City Public Schools' new high school Twilight Program will open its doors to welcome students in September 2001. The alternative program will be ready to accept 50-60 students in each of our comprehensive high schools: Dickinson, Ferris, Lincoln and Snyder, who present a likely risk of dropping out of school before graduation. School for students in the Twilight Program will begin at 3:30 p.m. and end at 8 p.m. Students selected will attend school in their home high school.

Parents will be involved in a counseling meeting regarding reasons why referral to the Twilight Program is recommended and given an opportunity to take part in the decision. It is anticipated that, since parents want their children to succeed, most parents will be in favor of this new opportunity.

The students will be immersed in a project-centered environment with mastery based on course proficiencies. The student ratio will be 12:1. New Jersey Core Curriculum Content and Workplace Readiness Standards will be addressed through the project-based model of instruction. Students will also be placed in work situations as part of their career readiness curriculum, whenever possible.

Each site will have a head teacher and a number of content teachers. Support staff will include a full-time guidance counselor, a half-time social worker and a nurse. All staff will work closely together to provide students with another chance to complete their education and receive a high school diploma. Our students deserve another chance, and the Jersey City Public Schools will provide that opportunity.

HSPT/HSPA, GEPA and ESPA Staff Development (page 32)

District supervisors will:

- Provide staff development during the summer of 2000 and extending throughout the school year across the district (particularly in the high schools) in Reading, Writing, Math, Science with special focus on ways to teach reading of all text types in all subject areas;
- Review test specifications;
- Explain use of various rubrics;
- Provide appropriate test preparation materials;
- Demonstrate how effective strategies, particularly reading strategies, may be incorporated into the everyday curriculum during ongoing workshops;
- Analyze and prepare reports for teachers regarding deficiencies in their school's results on particular text types and math and writing skills.
- Expect emergency lesson plans, more detailed and sophisticated, to be available for substitutes.

Vice principals will:

- Monitor HSPT/HSPA implementation in their assigned content areas on a daily basis and submit weekly reports to the principal.

Every 9th and 10th grade student will use a 1999 Prentice Hall anthology in ten-credit English course that is aligned to the NJCCCS and State assessments.

Successful



Unsuccessful



Explanation of Success:

Ongoing staff development opportunities were planned and held so as to better familiarize and prepare teachers for ESPA, GEPA preparation. The district hired more than five hundred (500) new instructional staff members in September 2000, and those individuals needed basic staff development with the State Testing Program. This information was provided as part of the New Teacher Orientation held in August 2000 and on subsequent school and district staff development days. Additionally, district supervisors conducted grade-level meetings in all of the elementary and middle schools at all grade levels encompassing language arts, mathematics, science and social studies on a daily basis. Moreover, supervisors and professional development school “instructional coaches,” who are excellent teachers who have been trained as a cadre of professional development providers in different areas, conducted ongoing informal and formal staff development at the school and district level to various groups of teachers who volunteered to participate in district-sponsored sessions. Furthermore, outside consultants and experts were hired at the school level, in conjunction with their selected model for WSR, to provide professional development for improving student achievement related to the nine elements of Whole School Reform, the district’s curriculum, and the State tests. Finally, the district hired outside consultants and provided nine (9) Saturdays of full-day staff development directly connected to ESPA and GEPA Language Arts and Mathematics. More than two hundred fifty (250) teachers attended each of these Saturday sessions held throughout January, February and March 2001. With the State’s new 100-hour Continuing Education mandate, teachers have received an additional incentive for participating in these sessions. This has been beneficial to the district and our students.

Finally, as a result of close monitoring by senior administrative staff, supervisors and building administrators were held accountable for all strategies as presented. While comprehensive emergency plans were always available for substitutes, the limited pool of quality substitutes rendered many of these plans useless.

Corrective Action School-Level Plans (page 34)

- After a school visit by Associate Superintendent of Instruction, the administrators develop a plan with the assistance of staff and SMT members to set improvement goals for areas found deficient.
- Plans are read by Associate Superintendent of Instruction and reviewed to see if actions noted will result in correction of deficiencies. Plans are then approved or rejected. Rejected plans require further development.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

As a result of visits during the 1999-00 school year, plans were developed, received and implemented in 2000-01.

Improvement of Lowest Performing Elementary Students (page 35)

In accordance with our school-level plans, which focus on our lowest performing schools, measures will be taken as follows:

- Based on multiple measures, it will be recommended that 4th grade students identified as at risk attend ESPA Prep during Extended Day classes, Super Saturday classes and/or ESPA Summer Institute.
- Based on spring ESPA, it will be recommended that 5th grade students identified as at risk attend ESPA Prep during Extended Day classes, Super Saturday and/or ESPA Summer Institute.
- Based on the previous year's final grades, teacher judgment and self-selection, students in grades 3 and 6 will attend the "Extended Day" program to focus on areas of weakness (reading, writing, math and science).
- Based on a fall GEPA practice test (The Learning Consortium) and teacher judgment, 8th grade students identified as at risk must attend GEPA Prep during Extended Day classes and/or Super Saturday programs to ensure graduation.
- Based on the previous year's final grades, January district mid-term exams, teacher judgment and self-selection, students in grade 7 will attend the GEPA Prep during Extended Day classes, Super Saturday and/or GEPA Summer Institute to focus on areas of weakness.
- By October 2000, guidance counselors will meet with 4th and 8th grade at-risk students and their parents/guardians to secure signed contracts of agreement to participate in ESPA and GEPA academic support programs.
- Use of ESPA/GEPA Plans developed by district supervisors
- Administration of a practice ESPA/GEPA downloaded from the NJDOE website

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

Throughout the 2000-01 school year, the district collaborated with not only the lowest performing elementary schools, but all elementary schools, to discuss and implement strategies for continuously improving student achievement at all grade levels. Much emphasis and focus was placed on improving student performance on the ESPA and GEPA in grades preceding the test grades. ESPA and GEPA focus groups, consisting of district teachers, supervisors and administrators, were formed and met several times to plan for ESPA and GEPA Test Preparation strategies. Strategies included stronger recommendations and school-level follow-up so that students in need attended and received services as part of the district's Extended Day, Super Saturdays and Summer School programs. This was done by having students and parents sign contracts early in the school year. Additionally, comprehensive ESPA and GEPA "Daily Test Preparation Booklets" were prepared, printed and distributed to each fourth grade student and every third, fourth, seventh and eighth grade teacher. The Test Preparation booklets were prepared for both ESPA and GEPA in the areas of Language Arts Literacy – Reading, Language Arts Literacy – Writing, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies. The test preparation activities were high-level problems modeled after the tests in format, content and structure. The material was integrated with district curriculum materials. Additionally, the district utilized the State-released ESPA and GEPA 2000 Sample Form Rehearsal Tests for administration to all fourth and eighth graders as a scheduled activity weeks before the actual test to provide students with practice in format and timed sequences. The tests were scored according to State guidelines. Additionally, the areas of student need were incorporated into daily instruction leading up to the test. As a result of these initiatives, as well as all of the district's curriculum, instruction, and assessment initiatives, improvement in the district's test scores has been realized on the March 2001 GEPA in the areas of language arts, mathematics and science. Improvements occurred at the school level (individual school results) and at the district level (improved district performance in mathematics and science). The 2001 ESPA results showed dramatic improvement in the area of language arts, although mathematics and science were slightly lower than the previous year.

All strategies were implemented and closely monitored by senior administrative staff. Regular reports were submitted identifying actual attendance at Extended Day and Super Saturdays. Building administrators monitored the implementation of school day activities.

Staff Development Linked to Supervision (page 37)

- Staff development opportunities will be developed as a result of supervision and instruction. This needs assessment will result in an expansion of the traditional forms of professional development into a comprehensive, ongoing program closely linked to district- and school-level educational plans, New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards, and student performance standards. Means of providing ongoing professional development include seminars and a Teacher Academy.
- Summer 2000 staff development opportunities include, but are not limited to:
 - *Engaging the Visual Learners: Graphic Organizers;*
 - *Engaging the Reluctant Writer;*
 - *Integration of Core Curriculum Content Standards;*
 - *Math Manipulatives;*
 - *NJSSI Summer Institute in Math;*
 - *The Geometer's Sketchpad, Basics and Beyond;*
 - *Exploring Geometry through Discovery;*
 - *Integration of Technology;*
 - *A+ For Kids Summer Science, Math and Technology Institute Conference;*
 - *New Technologies in the Science Classroom;*
 - *Great Ideas in Science K-12 Summer Workshop;*
 - *Mentoring/Professional Development Schools;*
 - *Technology training;*
 - *Whole School Reform training;*
 - *World Language Institute; and,*
 - *Early Childhood Institute.*

Successful



Unsuccessful



Explanation of Success:

Continued staff development, monitoring of instruction and increased support by district supervisors, assistance of senior staff members in lowest performing schools, and staff instruction on implementing Core Curriculum Content Standards produce success on State assessments.

Administrative Staff Development (page 39)

- **Principal Mentoring Program**

The program provides novice and veteran building principals with intensive, high-level, one-on-one personal and professional support they can rely upon to meet the challenge of their critical positions in the schools and develop into effective, successful school leaders. The mentor in this program will be referred to as the principal's associate. The associate will truly act as a partner or professional companion of the principal. The mentor will be working with and supporting the efforts of the principal in action, on the job throughout the school year from September until May.

- **Administrative Internship Program**

A Supportive Administrative Intern will work with a district supervisor, a building athletic director or other supervisory personnel for five (5) hours per week beyond the regular school day, while a School Administrative Intern will work with a building-level administrator for five (5) hours per week before school, during preparation periods and beyond the regular school day. The Supportive Administrative Intern performs a specific comprehensive duty in two or three of the following areas; the School Administrative Intern performs a specific comprehensive duty in each of the following areas:

- Curriculum development;
- Student management;
- Parent/community relations;
- School organization and management

- **Principals' Institute**

The intent of this staff development initiative is to raise awareness of current issues by providing speakers renowned in the field of education. New principals are given opportunities for growth at nearby universities, and all principals are apprised of workshops to address their individual needs.

- **Institute for Instructional Leadership**

This initiative provides staff members with training and exposure to the demands of an administrative position. It endeavors to provide models for effective and dynamic administrators.

- **Summer Institute for Administrators and Supervisors**

A series of inservice classes at the end of the school year when current topics of interest, new developments in the field of education and planning strategies are addressed by the entire administrative staff.

Collaboration with Fordham University for aspiring administrators. Successful completion of the program of study will result in eligibility for New Jersey certification as a school principal.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

All strategies were successfully implemented and greeted with enthusiasm by staff. Due to the large number of applicants, selection of participants was held to high standards.

Support by Administrative Staff (page 42)

- Supervisors were assigned an average of eighty staff evaluations during the course of the school year. Each supervisor cooperatively developed weekly schedules that reflected assignments to particular schools on a full-time basis during school hours.
- Supervisors who have the expertise and responsibility for the evaluation of staff have assumed an enhanced role as department chairpersons. They replaced former chairpersons, usually the best teachers, who were now returned to classrooms. Greater emphasis has been placed upon the quality of instruction. In addition to their responsibilities for observing instruction and evaluating staff, the department chairpersons also organize and present staff development workshops at the school site, as well as at conferences. They develop and distribute a monthly newsletter for all staff in their department. This newsletter directs attention to current developments in the field, instructional strategies and techniques, gives notice of current staff development opportunities and shares the accomplishments of students and staff.
- In addition to the department chairpersons, the position of department coordinator was created in the high schools. These individuals maintain a full teaching load and conduct their coordinator job responsibilities before and after school or on their free time. Their responsibilities include assisting and providing materials to staff.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

Supervisors were required to complete fifty (instead of the originally planned eighty) evaluations, and forty support activities. The combination of these evaluation and support activities provided teachers with the assistance required to effectuate successful delivery of instruction. Supervisors and department coordinators worked collaboratively to ensure that staff in respective disciplines received the support, materials, and technical assistance necessary to implement the curriculum.

Educational Apprentice Program (page 44)

- An effort to recruit teachers who have completed student teaching prior to passing the National Teacher Examination to fill short and long term vacancies (more than two weeks) to ensure continuity of instruction.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

The use of newly certified teachers to fill vacancies proved to be successful in providing continuity of instruction. However, after discussion with the teachers' union, the term "apprentices" was dropped, although they were still offered contracts if their performance was deemed satisfactory by supervisors and building administrators.

IMPLEMENTATION OF 6A:24 **URBAN EDUCATION REFORM REGULATIONS**

Whole School Reform Implementation Status (page 45)

The district's efforts in implementing Whole School Reform and all of the key initiatives as a result of the State Supreme Court's decision in *Abbott v. Burke* have intensified during the 2000-01 school year. Six elementary schools participated as part of the State's Cohort II in September 2000. Five additional schools entered in the "Mid-Year Second Cohort" in January 2001. The remaining twenty-one elementary and middle schools joined Whole School Reform as part of Cohort III in September 2001. As part of the implementation process, each elementary and middle school was to have identified, selected, and begun implementation of a State-approved Whole School Reform model by September 2001. This was successfully completed. All of the district's elementary and middle schools were required to develop and submit program implementation plans, school-level technology plans and school-based budgets in December 2000 to ensure the effective and timely implementation of the Abbott mandates. Furthermore, all of the district's middle and secondary schools submitted the Required Programs in Secondary Schools' plans in December 2000. The district's six high schools identified, selected and began implementation of a Whole School Reform model as part of the State's "Mid-Year Third Cohort" in January 2001. Moreover, the district submitted its comprehensive Early Childhood Plan, as well as its Alternative Education Plans for middle and secondary school students in order to provide students with appropriate and educationally enriching learning situations in those particular situations.

The following chart is included as a comprehensive update of model selection and implementation in the schools. The school-level and program-specific plans described above (and others) are available, but have not been duplicated here. Above all, it is the district's belief that Whole School Reform is the basis of the entire plan, and should not be relegated to a "section" of the plan.

District-Wide Whole School Reform Implementation Barriers & Issues (page 47)

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 1			
Type: E Grade Level: K – 3 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 2000	Status: The Co-NECT Model worked well in P.S. #1 during 2000-01. The Co-NECT school-level consultant for our school did several workshops with the teachers.	Barriers encountered in implementation: Implementation got off to a late start after our initial meeting because the assigned Co-NECT school-level consultant was being trained in September. A new Co-NECT school-level consultant came in January.	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 3			
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K - 8 Cohort: Mid-year 2 nd Cohort (2B) Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 2000	Status: The Co-NECT model for Whole School Reform has had a positive impact on our school community during the 2000-01 school year. In June of 2000, after school was completed for students, the faculty and staff returned for three days of in-service by the Co-NECT staff. Teachers began planning for first year of implementation with a solid foundation in the basic premises of the five Co-NECT benchmarks. The SMT had developed Action Plans for year one based on an analysis of the input gathered from the staff during the January to June preparation time for the Mid-Year Cohort. The Conwell School community was pleased to present a comprehensive school project fair in April and proudly welcomed a Progress Review Team to evaluate our first year's performance.	Barriers encountered in implementation: The barriers encountered in the Co-NECT implementation process can be directly related to our facility. The first problem relates to technology. Ten of our classes are housed in Annex rooms, which have not been connected to the Internet. Many of the Co-NECT activities depend on Internet access: (1) staff development modules; (2) project builder programs; and, (3) telecollaboration with classes in other Co-NECT schools. The second barrier relates to Common Planning time for some of our teachers. Our school is spread across three city blocks, and it is difficult for teachers to meet and use their time productively when a lot of time is spent moving students from building to building for special classes and programs. (It should be noted that P.S. #3 will be replaced; groundbreaking has occurred.)	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 5			
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K - 8 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 2000	Status: As a result of the first Co-NECT Progress Review (conducted on May 10, 2001), the following strengths and challenges were identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The high expectations set forth by the administration and faculty were reflected in the quality of student work.• There was a strong emphasis on the writing process across the curriculum.• Teachers and students used a variety of media to illustrate and present project work.• Project work reflected an understanding of the material but should include more opportunities for real world application. (This is an important component of project-based learning.)• There was evidence of project-based learning; however, further training and development are needed to ensure the application of PBL	Barriers encountered in implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lack of sufficient training on the process of project-based learning• Lack of support on district designated staff development days by Co-NECT• Lack of time for training and meetings with Co-NECT School Consultant and the Design Team• Scheduling (need for more common planning time)• The use of Pacing Charts inhibit the project-based learning process• Amount of time needed to administer the IDPT test for ESL students also inhibits the project-based learning process• Failure and lack of technology equipment• Lack of technical support for the equipment	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 5 (continued)		
	<p>throughout the school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More emphasis needs to be placed on Math and Science as primary content areas for project work. 	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 6		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Comer Implemented: September 2000	Status: Staff has had the opportunity to become knowledgeable about the Comer process and to develop and work on integrative committees/subcommittees. There is a renewed commitment to improving and supporting teaching and facilitating the holistic development of students. Staff development that addresses the academic and developmental needs of the students remains ongoing.	Barriers encountered in implementation: Budget timelines and restrictions limited the flexibility to allocate resources effectively. The school-based budgeting process was a confusing and frustrating experience. As of this date, our budget has not yet been approved, limiting our ability to plan effectively for 2001-02.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 8		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Comer Implemented: September 2000	Status: The components of the WSR Model were, for the most part, successfully carried out. Subcommittees were established, and, through those committees, many of the activities of the school year were implemented. Parental involvement increased; the SMT, as well as many staff members, received additional training; the SSST is now a working Team; and, the Extended Day Program, along with the 21 st Century Program, and extension teachers increased the number of children who received additional help.	Barriers encountered in implementation: The size of P.S. #8 makes it very difficult to successfully reach the entire staff. One hour a month is not enough (district contract meeting time allocation). There has not been sufficient coverage for teachers to receive training either within the school or outside. Parental involvement is a very slow process. It is difficult to plan for programs, speakers, etc. because of the process we need to go through in order to get our allotted funds. The amount of time that we spent on the State-mandated school-based budget process was not warranted with all the cuts that were made to it after completion and submission. If we are going to successfully implement our plan, we need the staffing that we have requested in our budget plan.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 9		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Comer Implemented: September 2000	Status: <p>The Kennedy School initiated the WSR implementation by conducting a needs assessment survey of the staff and Parent Team. SMT subcommittees have been formed with an accountability system of attendance sheet and meeting minutes. Subcommittee liaisons report at SMT meetings, faculty meetings, and in the newsletter.</p> <p>Two (district) six-hour in-service days focusing on the Comer WSR model were held. SIQA surveys were administered to the entire staff and Parent Team to assess implementation progress. New initiatives such as parental themes, celebrations, student of the month, and uniform compliance incentives were established.</p>	Barriers encountered in implementation: As our submitted school-based budget went through the revision process at the State level, funds needed to support reward incentives for students and parents are not available. Alternative sources of funding from private corporations will have to be researched to fully support our WSR program.

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 11		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Comer Implemented: September 2000	Status: P.S. #11 has successfully established an SMT that has run monthly meetings using group process. Committees have been formed, and the staff is working toward accepting the use of group process, team building and learning and using the steps involved in developing a plan for implementation. Communication among and between groups has occurred.	Barriers encountered in implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time restraints—for meetings, for training and SMT discussions • Conflicting directives from Comer, the district, the State • Lack of cooperation from unwilling staff members • SMT members receiving training at Yale at different times • Implementation plan and school-based budget not being approved to date (June 2001)
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 12		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 2000	Status: Julia A. Barnes School has embarked upon their task of Whole School Reform with a positive fervor. This, our initial year into our whole school model, Co-NECT, has been a collaborative learning experience for staff, students and parents. The staff completed all required prerequisite workshops supplied by Co-NECT, as well as in-house professional development developed by our facilitator and WSR Design Team. On May 8 and 10, we fulfilled our culminating activities, which were to host a formal Project Fair and the ensuing Progress Review. Feedback from the participants and guest of both activities were positive, which made staff and students confident that we are on the right track.	Barriers encountered in implementation: Both staff and community feel as though the Julia A. Barnes School did accomplish the majority of its goals or indicators for the first year of implementation. The few barriers we did experience were those of logistics with Co-NECT personnel and the upkeep of our technology.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 14		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 2 nd Cohort Model: Comer Implemented: September 1999	Status: The 1999-00 school year was a pilot year for P.S. #14 in implementing the School Development Program (Comer) as part of Cohort II. Our entire SMT has been trained at Yale University in the utilization of the "Guiding Principles," Developmental Pathways and Team Building Techniques. The creation of several "Comer" committees such as Discipline, Budget, etc. has been established along with a weekly SSST Team and Bi-monthly SMT. Relationships have been established with all stakeholders in the delivery of instruction with full understanding of the NJCCCS.	Barriers encountered in implementation: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shortages of qualified candidates and applicants in various support staff positions 2. Teachers not being cognizant of the many adversities that affect students' behaviors when they arrive at school 3. Lack of parental support in maintaining student code of conduct
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 15		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: Mid-year 2 nd Cohort (2B) Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 2000	Status: The Co-NECT Project Fair was held on May 31, 2001. We have attained mid-level of targeted benchmarks so far this year. Awaiting State Certification of school's WSR budget/plan for the upcoming school year.	Barriers encountered in implementation: To date, our school's Co-NECT facilitator has not been trained due to her mid-year appointment. Awaiting communication from Co-NECT as to training date scheduled for summer 2001. Co-NECT's school consultant has been absent for 2+ months due to a car accident. As a result, staff training and surveys are not finished.

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 16		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Comer Implemented: September 2000	Status: Each interaction with New Jersey implementation coordinator for Comer gave us a different view of Whole School Reform. We are more confident now with the process. However, we need more clarity of the roles of the subcommittees.	Barriers encountered in implementation: We believe that, with a Comer district steering committee, many of the questions and concerns that we have encountered in our initial year of change would be clarified. Parental involvement and trust in this change process seem to be barriers for the faculty to overcome.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 17		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 2 nd Cohort Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 1999	Status: The Joseph H. Brensinger School (P.S. #17) is in the second year of WSR implementation. Our teachers have received intensive training from the Co-NECT consultants concerning the Co-NECT Exchange, Backplanning, and Quality Projects. In addition, a number of teachers have attended Co-NECT mini-sabbaticals on Assessment and Rubrics, Teaching and Learning, and Integration of Technology. Teachers have also received technology training from Tomorrow Today, project-based training from IDE, and turnkey training from the technology coaches. Most of our teachers have begun to internalize the idea of project-based teaching and learning as a method of teaching curriculum content rather than as an additional requirement.	Barriers encountered in implementation: Some of the barriers to implementation include the lack of understanding of WSR on the part of some supervisory and purchasing department personnel, and lack of adequate training in the State school-based budgetary process for school-level personnel. In addition, members of the elected Board of Education might be interested in becoming more familiar with WSR. One of the main barriers encountered in implementation is the maintenance of the technology at the building level.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 20		
Type: E Grade Level: K – 5 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Comer Implemented: September 2000	Status: Six staff members have attended the training at Yale University. They have acted as turnkeys in training the rest of the staff on two staff development days, along with the Comer representative. The three teams dictated by the model—the School Management Team, the Student and Staff Support Team, and the Parent Team—are all in place and meeting regularly. There are four committees: Curriculum and Assessment, Public Relations, School Climate and Parental Involvement. Participation by the staff is 100 percent. All committees meet twice a month. All committees and SMT agendas and minutes are displayed in the office. Friday mornings we have breakfast for all staff, which we use as an exchange of ideas between different committee members. The consensus at Public School No. 20 is that our first year of implementation has been very successful.	Barriers encountered in implementation: Although the staff that attended Comer training has done a wonderful job training the rest of the staff, we still need more people to attend the Comer training. Two or three days a year are not enough. Parent participation has been limited, but our expectation when we have a full-time parent facilitator on board next year is for more parent involvement.

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 22		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 2000	Status: We have completed our first year as a Co-NECT School. The entire faculty has been trained in the three primary workshops established to ensure that project-based learning is effectively implemented. The majority of the teachers have bought into PBL as an instructional focus, and, as evidenced by our Project Fair, the students have responded in kind. Teachers and students have also displayed a facility in using all forms of available technology through daily use and after-school instructional workshops. The students in the five classes implementing Breakthrough to Literacy have shown remarkable progress in acquiring literacy skills. Planning and instruction showed greater facility in grades 4-8, and more of a challenge for those teachers in the primary grades where direct instruction remains the primary instructional model.	Barriers encountered in implementation: First, the staff development required for staff members has conflicted with contractual obligations. The number of available days for staff development was inadequate for the hours required for each workshop, and common planning time was not readily available for such a large staff. Secondly, developing the State-mandated school-based budget, which encompasses the necessary technology and other elements to implement project-based learning and Co-NECT, has been arduous. What the school deems necessary in implementing a technology-based Whole School Reform model—e.g., computers—the State determines is unnecessary. Thirdly, planning for project-based learning while ensuring adherence to pacing charts and utilizing GEPA and ESPA preparation materials has been overwhelming and confusing.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 23		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 2000	Status: The staff of P.S. #23 has received various levels of training on how to implement project-based learning and technology into the lesson planning process. They have received training from our Co-NECT Consultant and our School Facilitator on staff in-service days and during school hours. We conducted a Progress Review to evaluate our progress and to assist us in determining what we would like to work on for the 2001-02 school year. We have also conducted a Project Fair during the evening Open House in April 2001 to share our hard work with the community.	Barriers encountered in implementation: Our computer lab was not up and running from September until January 2001. A great deal of the training necessary for this program required staff to work on computers. Training needed to be conducted in classrooms utilizing only three computers at a time. Due to the extensive amount of training necessary and the size of our staff, we were unable to complete all of the training in the first year of the program. We will need to complete the training in the second year of the program.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 24		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Comer Implemented: September 2000	Status: As of May 18, 2001, our implementation plan and budget for 2001-02 have been approved. We have sent teachers to Comer 101 & 102 training and also to Atlantic City. Our SMT and SSST are operating under Comer guidelines. We have ten Comer committees that have been established and are functioning including all staff members. We are in the process of forming a Parent Team. An administrator will be attending the Principals' Academy.	Barriers encountered in implementation: The barriers encountered in implementation were insufficient time and training for preparing such an extensive school-based budget and plan. We spent hours gathering data to support our needs—only to find many items were cut or deleted. The Comer staff is not meeting our needs: They are slow or negligent in responding to phone calls or e-mail regarding important questions. They do not provide the necessary support and feedback that it takes to implement the program in a timely fashion.

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 25			
Type: E Grade Level: K – 8 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 2000		Status: <u>Based on Final Report Progress Review (5/02/01):</u> ➤ Mutual Expectations Results Co-NECT Met 1 Working to 6 Leadership Met 3 Working to 3 Faculty Met 2 Working to 4 District Working to 5 Community Met 1 Working to 3 ➤ Evidence of Quality Teaching 1. 3.50 2. 3.75 3. 3.25 4. 3.25 5. 3.50 6. 3.25 7. 3.00 8. 3.50 9. 3.25 10. <u>3.00</u> 33.25 = 3.325 Average ➤ Use of Co-NECT Exchange ➤ 7 or higher score-presenters/facilitators ➤ Progress in all five Co-NECT benchmarks ➤ Attendance—Whole School Reform and events – 80% ➤ Review evidence of teamwork and shared responsibility for student achievement ➤ Design Team—organized and meeting ➤ Evidence of Learning 1. 3 2. 3 3. 4 4. 4 5. <u>4</u> 18 = 3.6 Average	Barriers encountered in implementation: Difficulties in scheduling training sessions: lack of staff—Co-NECT; covering classes to release teachers during school time to attend workshops; faculty meetings devoted to Co-NECT training; issue of use of preparation periods; lack of interest in attending paid after-school sessions.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 27			
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 2 nd Cohort Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 1999		Status: Co-NECT has allowed our school to form various committees. Due to the efforts of the Facilities Committee, we have alleviated overcrowding in many classrooms (8 trailers were added). We have had much more community involvement since becoming a Co-NECT school. A	Barriers encountered in implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none">District limitations such as pacing charts, midterm exams, required thematic tests, scheduling restrictionsObsolete computers that are slow and crash regularly

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 27 (continued)		
	<p>community/parent directory is available to teachers. Computer classes have been made available to parents. Student-led conferences will be piloted in four classes early next year. Teachers have designed and implemented engaging projects using the backplanning process. Many staff members are willing to adopt the Co-NECT model as evidenced by participation in the Project Fairs, posting of project work, participation on committees, and the increased use of technology. Students can articulate about what they are learning. Projects are standards-based and include driving questions, rubrics, and performance tasks. Alternatives to the schedule are still being investigated to allow more planning time for teachers and more project time for students. All teachers have access to the Internet. Students regularly use the Internet in many classrooms. Some projects require the use of presentation software, AlphaSmart keyboards, digital cameras, video cameras, and tape recorders. A tech team of students has been established to address technology problems.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inability to complete turnkey training without Word, PowerPoint, and Excel in all classrooms • Too few computers in classrooms • Lack of technician to troubleshoot technology problems • Limited access to the Internet in classrooms (one per classroom; none in 4th and 5th grade classrooms in portable trailers) • Training and mentorship of new staff • Getting new staff into GroupWise e-mail • Lack of a computer lab for teacher training and large group use • Communication with parents and lack of involvement
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 28		
<p>Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 3rd Cohort Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 2000</p>	<p>Status: Successful completion of year one of Co-NECT implementation. Staff has been trained in components of Co-NECT and WSR elements. PBL has been integrated into instruction in all classrooms. Various committees have been established to improve student achievement and integrate technology into the curriculum.</p>	<p>Barriers encountered in implementation: Difficulty with Co-NECT representatives—late starting date. Resistance to change among staff.</p>
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 29		
<p>Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 4 Cohort: 3rd Cohort Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 2000</p>	<p>Status: Through the utilization of the Co-NECT methodology, the staff was able to provide project-based learning incorporating technology into instruction. Co-NECT has allowed teachers to take advantage of the resources that the school community provides. Through this partnership of school and community, we have greatly improved our basic skills and analytical thinking, and accessed new information that has enhanced what the children will learn.</p> <p>We piloted Breakthrough to Literacy in seven classes (kindergarten and self-contained). It has helped to provide recovery as well as reinforcement of skills through the use of computer software, direct instruction and guided reading. This program has truly been a success that has enabled us to extend it into the first grade.</p>	<p>Barriers encountered in implementation: We experienced very few barriers. However, the following delayed the implementation of the Breakthrough to Literacy Program:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Late delivery of program. We had anticipated the arrival of the program at an earlier date. 2. Computers unable to handle the specifications outlined by program.

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 30		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 5 Cohort: 2 nd Cohort Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 1999	Status: We are very pleased with our 2000-01 WSR implementation. 1. Assessment —A comparison of our 1999-00 midterm exams at grade 4 indicate a 12 percent increase in our reading scores; a 1 percent increase in writing; and, a 30 percent increase in mathematics. 2. Staff Development —Our staff development design for 2000-01 created a cadre of grade-level experts in technology, assessment and project-based learning. Grade-level experts received an average of more than fifty hours of training from Co-NECT, Tomorrow Today, and IDE. They, in turn, provided grade-level instruction and expertise where needed in the building. 3. Discipline —A Crisis Teacher was hired for the 2000-01 school year. A comparison of out-of-school suspensions for the 2000-01 school year suggests a 73 percent reduction. 4. Project-Based Learning —Staff development enabled each grade level to directly link the WSR project-based activities with the NJCCCS. 5. School Climate —The climate of the Alexander D. Sullivan School improved significantly during the 2000-01 school year with our Co-NECT implementation. Additional staff helped lower teacher-student ratios. Staff development increased professional proficiency. Project-based learning helped focus student attention on standards driven interdisciplinary activities.	Barriers encountered in implementation: None
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 31		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 2 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 2000	Status: During the 2000-01 school year, Anthony J. Infante School successfully met benchmarks and implemented project-based learning utilizing technology. The Co-NECT WSR model principles were incorporated throughout the building. The inclusion of our special	Barriers encountered in implementation: Teachers needed intensive training in the use of technology and its implementation as a teaching tool. It was also necessary for faculty members to adapt Co-NECT guidelines to our special education population, as the model has very limited experience with our unique population.

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 31 (continued)		
	education population along with regular education students was evident throughout the project. The use of technology was utilized to the fullest to meet Core Curriculum Content Standards.	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 33		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 4 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 2000	Status: In accordance with the Co-NECT Whole School Reform model that is being implemented at P.S. #33 after completing our first year of the Co-NECT model, our status is the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Design Team was formed and it created school Action Plans; 2. The entire staff was trained in all the learning modules that facilitate the implementation of the model; and, 3. The school had a Project Fair and a Progress Review and will use the challenges that were suggested in the Progress Review to create next year's Action Plans. 	Barriers encountered in implementation: None
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 34		
Type: E Grade Level: K – 8 Cohort: Mid-year 2 nd Cohort (2B) Model: Comer Implemented: September 2000	Status: P.S. #34 has implemented the following according to the Comer Model: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Six (6) Subcommittees—which are functioning; 2. SMT—which represents all grade levels and subcommittees; 3. SSS Team—which meets weekly; 4. Four (4) In-service Comer Workshops; and, 5. Two (2) teachers and one (1) principal attended Yale 101. (More will attend in 2001-02.) 	Barriers encountered in implementation: None
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 37		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Alternative School Model Implemented: September 2000	Status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In process of seeking new personnel • Redefining elements of the model for senior staff • Redefining elements for new staff 	Barriers encountered in implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication—Timeliness One hand not knowing what the other hand is doing (State, district, school) • Paperwork Not timely to comply with purchase deadlines • Money Continuous changes in budget allocations causing confusion regarding preparedness for opening in September 2001 • S.O.P. Need flexibility when dealing with alternate design model established practices.

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 38		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 2000	Status: Our staff is basically satisfied with the model that was selected. The benchmarks were very helpful in implementing the model and served to increase involvement in the overall climate of the school. Uncertainty experienced in the beginning of the year about project expectations was alleviated by the end of the year. Our project fair was an overwhelming success.	Barriers encountered in implementation: Adherence to the Board of Education's pacing charts limits the implementation of true project-based learning. (For instance, if teachers planned six 8-week projects, the skills could be learned within the project development.) Co-NECT staff was inadequate to properly service the district on staff development days. State school-based application/budgeting process was disgraceful! There was inconsistent, inadequate direction from the State representatives. Insufficient time allotted to prepare the 200 plus pages. Hours were wasted on preparation when the State really had dollar caps that they revealed to the schools when we went for the budget revisions.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 39		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 2 nd Cohort Model: Comer Implemented: September 1999	Status: The following School Development Program elements, as outlined in the Implementation Plan, have been achieved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-3 Guided Reading Program • Math Extension Grades 4 & 5 • Reduction in the number of suspensions • Nine fully-functioning subcommittees • Full-time Licensed Clinical Social Worker • Two full-time guidance counselors 	Barriers encountered in implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to secure a full-time technology coordinator in a timely fashion • Failure to secure a full-time library/media coordinator • Budget issues related to accounting codes
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 40		
Type: M Grade Level: 6 – 8 Cohort: Mid-year 2 nd Cohort (2B) Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 2000	Status: P.S. #40 is nearing completion of the first year of implementing Co-NECT as our Whole School Reform model. Over 95 percent of our staff have completed the nine hours of foundation workshops required for Co-NECT schools. We have actively participated in all aspects of Professional Development including the Facilitators Institute, Principals' Summit, Technology Conference, Project-Based Learning Conference, Critical Friends and the monthly facilitators' meeting. We have presented our project fair and underwent a very positive and successful progress review during May 2001. Our design team is working toward benchmarking our school for F.Y. 2001-02.	Barriers encountered in implementation: Our major barrier in implementing all aspects of Whole School Reform is common planning time among grade levels and project teams. Our technology requests that have been restricted by State Fiscal Personnel have limited adaptation of our technology plan submitted November 2000. We also strive to motivate parental and community involvement in our Co-NECT Action Plans.

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 41		
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 2 nd Cohort Model: Comer Implemented: September 1999	Status: P.S. #41 continues to successfully implement The Comer Process in our school. There is a pervasive knowledge and understanding of the nine elements of Whole School Reform, especially among the instructional staff and student body. There has been the creation of a discipline committee, implementation of class size reduction, and zero-based budgeting. We have a functioning SMT and SSST. Our staff development includes turnkey training. We have also instituted a Decision-Making Initiative.	Barriers encountered in implementation: Some of the barriers that have been encountered include the lack of the District Steering Committee having consensus among model developer, Abbott regulations and district guidelines. The lack of district-wide SMT team building is another barrier to implementation, along with the need for greater parent/community involvement.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 42		
Type: E Grade Level: K – 4 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Comer Implemented: September 2000	Status: This year, the staff of P.S. #42 attended various training—Yale 101 and 102, Comer Network Retreat in Atlantic City and Network Meetings in Edison, New Jersey (PIRC). In addition, the principal and members of the SSST attended meetings conducted by Yale SDP staff. Parent Council members were apprised of Comer Principles during a presentation by Mrs. Youmans in the fall and Mr. Maldarelli in the spring. Mr. Maldarelli also presented to POPS participants. We have reached out to community by distributing our newsletter, inviting community members to participate on our SMT and to attend our Health Fair on May 11, 2001. We formed a partnership with the Grandview Senior Citizens. Our students have visited and performed for the seniors, and our school facilitator is instructing them on the uses of the new computers that they recently obtained. All subcommittees are meeting regularly, completing various projects and reporting/discussing progress during SMT meetings.	Barriers encountered in implementation: No real barriers—just a misunderstanding of Comer's role. It was not clear exactly what would occur during site visits. Consequently, we reached out to NJCU staff to provide professional development according to an assessment of our needs.
ACADEMY I		
Type: M Grade Level: 6 – 8 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Coalition of Essential Schools Implemented: September 2000	Status: Academy I has been slowly assimilating the CES Principles into the building. The school came to a consensus on goals. Task forces were developed to devise activities that address the identified goals. Next year, activities developed by the task forces will be implemented throughout the school.	Barriers encountered in implementation: We have encountered very few barriers. In a small school, it is difficult to permit too many staff members to attend conferences at the same time. In addition, next year we hope to have two positions mandated by the RPSS in place.

ACADEMY II		
Type: M Grade Level: 7 – 8 Cohort: Mid-year 2 nd Cohort (2B) Model: America's Choice Implemented: September 2000	Status: Academy II continues to move forward in implementing the elements of the five Design Tasks that drive our efforts in promoting high student performance. The focus of Stage I was on the Writer's Workshop. We were able to address Stage I at various levels of success. We implemented a Twenty-five Book Campaign, a model classroom for Writer's Workshop, Principal's Book of the Month Program, and weekly teacher training sessions. We were able to establish community support from the Bank of New York, The Brunswick Avenue Garden Association, C-Town (Jersey Avenue), Jersey Cares, Volunteers of America, and CSFB Direct (Financial Company). All teachers were trained to establish a standards-based classroom. We received monthly assistance from the Model trainers. The facilitators received ongoing training on various strategies that they were expected to transfer into the school. The first full year has evidence of success and, with a maturing staff, we expect greater achievement in the coming year. The students read and wrote more in one year than they had in previous years. Over 2000 books were read during the year!	Barriers encountered in implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conflicts experienced by new teachers just trying to establish classroom awareness and management techniques; • Missed meetings by facilitators; • Minimal parent support and follow up with programs; • Limited time for staff to learn the strategies and implement them consistently; • Not enough specialists to allow for teacher release to receive training.
DICKINSON HIGH SCHOOL		
Type: S Grade Level: 9 – 12 Cohort: Mid-year 3 rd Cohort (3B) Model: Talent Development Model Implemented: September 2001	Status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • December 4, 2000—DHS staff votes for Talent Development WSR Model with 85 percent acceptance • April 16, 2001—Talent Development Fair at DHS, model developers present an all-day in-service to DHS staff • May 15-16, 2001—Mr. Leo Jones returns to DHS for a 2-day small group orientation in Library • May 15, 2001—Mr. Leo Jones presents Memo of Understanding to Mr. Donato (copy to Dr. Epps for signature) • May 24, 2001—Principals' Network-Challenges of Leadership in Talent Development High School 	Barriers encountered in implementation: None as yet; model implementation to be phased in during 2001-02. Planning year followed by a two-year implementation (2001-2004)

FERRIS HIGH SCHOOL		
Type: S Grade Level: 9 – 12 Cohort: Mid-year 3 rd Cohort (3B) Model: Coalition of Essential Schools Implemented: September 2001	Status: Coalition stresses a systemic approach to school reform rooted in the Ten Common Principles. Rather than mandating particular actions, CES challenges the school community to examine its priorities and to redesign curriculum, instruction, assessment and organizational structure. Ferris High School has been assigned two CES coaches to assist in our self-study, the first stage of WSR within the selected model. Several faculty members have attended conferences and forums, and our school profile has been entered into the National CES website, allowing us to communicate with other CES schools.	Barriers encountered in implementation: The primary barriers encountered to date are <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of a school-level facilitator; • Too few Site Management Team meetings for a model focusing on self-improvement; and, • Lack of clear direction due to Coalition of Essential Schools' non-intrusive design.
LIBERTY HIGH SCHOOL		
Type: S Grade Level: 9 – 10 Cohort: Mid-year 3 rd Cohort (3B) Model: Coalition of Essential Schools Implemented: September 2001	Status: Liberty High School chose the Coalition of Essential Schools Model. The Coalition coach worked with the staff and the SMT, and the school sent a planning group to the summer planning session, Summer Trek. The staff there will be making a plan for the coming school year, focusing on what the Coalition calls SMART goals related to student actions and achievements.	Barriers encountered in implementation: The process of applying for funding and the delays in getting the RPSS approval are considerable. It is difficult to plan when the resources to be made available aren't clear, and it is disheartening when the refusal of funding appears not to be done for good reason. Too many expectations are based on averages rather than specific school situations. There are inevitable conflicts in expectation between the district and the school, between the school and the model. To give just one example: With a small staff, it just isn't possible to attend the meetings the model wants the school to attend. There would be too many teachers out of too many classrooms. Two teachers are just about 20 percent of the staff. A school with a staff of two hundred can spare people that a school with a staff of eleven cannot.

LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL		
Type: S Grade Level: 9 – 12 Cohort: Mid-year 3 rd Cohort (3B) Model: Talent Development Model Implemented: September 2001	Status: Several initiatives have been undertaken at Lincoln High School to address the implementation of our WSR Model—Talent Development High School. During the 2001-02 academic year, we will be entering our planning year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The Lincoln High School faculty has participated in a full-day professional development program with Talent Development High School staff (4/16/01). The objective of this session was to educate our faculty as to the specifics of the various components of the model. ➤ A visit to Johns Hopkins University by our SMT was held June 15, 2001. This meeting provided us with the opportunity to consult with the model developers and discuss issues directly related to Lincoln High School. ➤ The SMT is in the process of seeking out volunteers to attend the Summer Conference and Workshop at Johns Hopkins University on August 9 and 10. A total of fifteen (15) participants have been budgeted for in the RPSS Grant Proposal. This conference focuses on schools entering the planning year in September 2001. ➤ We are in receipt of our approved RPSS Budget. 	Barriers encountered in implementation: Following the professional development program of April 16, 2001, concerns arose regarding the servicing of two Jersey City Schools on district-scheduled staff development days. Due to the limited number of available staff from TDHS, the workshops were overcrowded. Per our scheduled meeting of 6/15/01, we discussed our concerns with the model developers. In reviewing the approved RPSS Budget, several items were cut that were considered essential by the SMT—security guards, computers, scanners, printers, model implementation costs. We are appealing the decision.
MC NAIR ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOL		
Type: S Grade Level: 9 – 12 Cohort: Mid-year 3 rd Cohort (3B) Model: The Alternative Model Implemented: September 2001	Status: The NJDOE approved our WSR Alternative Plan on 4/27/01. The start-up grant of \$45,000 was also approved by the NJDOE. The grant has been submitted to the Board for acceptance. After acceptance, a posting must be made to hire the facilitator. Our school organization was reviewed on 5/30/01. This listed all staff needed to implement the Alternative Plan.	Barriers encountered in implementation: Late approval of the WSR Alternative Model and the grant. The WSR Alternative Model RPSS budget was cut by \$890,000 (approximately). A facilitator will be hired by September. Other staff needed were requested in the Table of Organization for 2001-02. After posting, interviews will be held. These will not take place until August 2001 when the administrators return from vacation, as we are unable to complete same in early July 2001. The \$890,000 cut to the RPSS Budget has been appealed.
SNYDER HIGH SCHOOL		
Type: S Grade Level: 9 – 12 Cohort: Mid-year 3 rd Cohort (3B) Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 2001	Status: Snyder High School selected Co-NECT as its Whole School Reform Model in January 2001. Every teacher in Snyder received a 4-hour training session on February 1, 2001. Co-NECT has been discussed during monthly faculty meetings and SMT meetings. The position of facilitator has been advertised throughout the district.	Barriers encountered in implementation: The only major obstacle that Snyder High School has encountered was obtaining the 75 percent faculty vote needed to select the Whole School Reform Model.

Implementation of Whole School Reform (page 48)

The following steps will be taken to adhere to the Abbott regulations and address the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards through Whole School Reform Implementation:

- Assist high schools with Whole School Reform exploration process so that they are prepared to select a model by January 30, 2001.
- Provide training for SMTs after elections of new members.
- Hold meetings with SRI personnel assigned to the district to ensure ongoing communication.
- Assist Cohort III with development of Whole School Reform plans
- Act as a “broker” between schools and program developers.
- Implement a district-wide Accountability Plan, including a system of rewards.
- Shift additional responsibility to the school level via the District Decentralization Plan.
- Assist schools with staff development plans.
- Assist Cohort III schools with the development of their school-level budgets.
- Assign Cohort III personnel based on Whole School Reform restructuring.
- Foster a networking system by WSR models for Cohort II and between Cohort II and Cohort III.
- Hire school level facilitators for all schools

Successful



Unsuccessful



Explanation of Success:

All steps outlined above have been taken, and all schools are becoming more accountable for student performance.

The implementation of Whole School Reform according to the Abbott regulations has been effectively and successfully instituted throughout the district. All schools—elementary, middle and secondary—have researched, selected and met State deadlines for adoption and implementation of State-approved Whole School Reform models as of January 31, 2001.

Six (6) schools began implementation as part of Cohort II in September 1999 and were in their second full year of implementation during the 2000-01 school year. For the five (5) schools that began planning their implementation in January 2001 as part of the State's "Mid-Year Second Cohort," they participated in their first full year of implementation during the 2000-01 school year. The remaining 21 elementary schools voted and selected a model during the spring of 2000 for implementation in September 2000 as part of Cohort III. Additionally, the district's six high schools met the State deadline for adopting a model. The six high schools became part of the State's "Mid-Year Cohort III" and began planning for implementation in January 2001. Achievement targets were designed by the SMTs of the Cohort II, Mid-Year Second Cohort and Cohort III schools which focused on improvement of students' reading scores, overall academic performance, attendance, a decrease in the number of dropouts, increased parental involvement and results of benchmark analyses, self-assessment methodologies, checklists and/or surveys particular to the model.

The Cohort II schools have shown varied growth in different areas of the GEPA and ESPA. It is truly too soon to judge the effects of the models on test performance, as developers state that it takes between 3-5 years to fully implement their models. Student performance for the Cohort II, Cohort IIB and Cohort III schools follow:

COHORT II SCHOOLS

School	Subject	ESPA							GEPA						
		May 1999 ¹	May 2000 ²	Diff. 1999 to 2000	April 2001 ³	Diff. 2000 to 2001	2001 Target	Diff. From Target	March 1999 ⁴	March 2000 ⁵	Diff. 1999 to 2000	March 2001 ⁶	Diff. 2000 to 2001	2001 Target	Diff. From Target
#14	Language Arts	17.2	22.2	5.0	29.8	7.6	42.2	-12.4	61.4	56.0	-5.4	42.9	-13.1	65.5	-22.6
	Mathematics	20.9	37.5	16.6	15.8	-21.7	56.3	-40.5	30.2	29.2	-1.0	21.4	-7.8	49.2	-27.8
	Science	42.6	54.0	11.4	45.7	-8.3	64.5	-18.8	N/A	43.8	N/A	33.3	-10.5	59.4	-26.1
#17	Language Arts	29.3	32.5	3.2	64.2	31.7	52.5	11.7	79.0	78.6	-0.4	69.3	-9.3	79.0	-9.7
	Mathematics	28.7	26.1	-2.6	34.3	8.2	46.1	-11.8	50.6	55.4	4.8	58.2	2.8	65.2	-7.0
	Science	62.6	60.4	-2.2	75.2	14.8	67.7	7.5	N/A	43.4	N/A	44.3	0.9	59.2	-14.9
#27	Language Arts	39.3	41.5	2.2	67.0	25.5	58.3	8.7	98.8	92.4	-6.4	92.2	-0.2	98.8	-6.6
	Mathematics	45.0	47.5	2.5	38.7	-8.8	61.3	-22.6	74.0	82.3	8.3	74.5	-7.8	82.3	-7.8
	Science	72.4	68.7	-3.7	65.4	-3.3	72.4	-7.0	N/A	74.7	N/A	76.7	2.0	75.0	1.7
#30	Language Arts	31.4	18.2	-13.2	63.2	45.0	38.2	25.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Mathematics	52.1	34.4	-17.7	50.0	15.6	54.4	-4.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Science	74.3	65.9	-8.4	74.7	8.8	74.3	0.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
#39	Language Arts	19.0	6.7	-12.3	22.9	16.2	26.7	-3.8	56.1	74.2	18.1	82.3	8.1	75.0	7.3
	Mathematics	11.7	20.3	8.6	20.4	0.1	40.3	-19.9	29.3	43.8	14.5	73.5	29.7	59.4	14.1
	Science	47.5	38.3	-9.2	34.7	-3.6	56.7	-22.0	N/A	34.4	N/A	55.9	21.5	54.4	1.5
#41	Language Arts	41.4	19.3	-22.1	32.9	13.8	41.4	-8.5	36.5	46.1	9.6	49.4	3.3	60.6	-11.2
	Mathematics	40.4	27.8	-12.6	6.3	-21.5	47.8	-41.5	7.0	6.6	-0.4	12.9	6.3	26.6	-13.7
	Science	55.0	45.5	-9.5	35.5	-10.0	60.3	-24.8	N/A	19.7	N/A	29.4	9.7	39.7	-10.3

¹As reported in the Revised January 2001 State Summary Book

²As reported in the January 2001 State Summary Book

³As reported in the Elementary School Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance (Report Printed 8/06/01)

⁴As reported in the December 1999 State Summary Book

⁵As reported in the January 2001 State Summary Book

⁶As reported in the Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance (Report Printed 6/08/01)

COHORT IIB SCHOOLS

School	Subject	ESPA							GEPA						
		May 1999 ¹	May 2000 ²	Diff. 1999 to 2000	April 2001 ³	Diff. 2000 to 2001	2001 Target	Diff. From Target	March 1999 ⁴	March 2000 ⁵	Diff. 1999 to 2000	March 2001 ⁶	Diff. 2000 to 2001	2001 Target	Diff. From Target
#3	Language Arts	76.8	43.6	-33.2	67.4	23.8	76.8	-9.4	91.9	89.3	-2.6	81.8	-7.5	91.9	-10.1
	Mathematics	81.4	48.7	-32.7	39.1	-9.6	81.4	-42.3	37.8	53.6	15.8	45.4	-8.2	64.3	-18.9
	Science	83.7	82.0	-1.7	69.5	-12.5	83.7	-14.2	N/A	57.2	N/A	39.4	-17.8	66.1	-26.7
#15	Language Arts	22.7	12.5	-10.2	26.1	13.6	32.5	-6.4	54.8	36.7	-18.1	21.2	-15.5	55.9	-34.7
	Mathematics	18.2	19.5	1.3	10.7	-8.8	39.5	-28.8	16.7	13.4	-3.3	16.7	3.3	33.4	-16.7
	Science	40.3	44.7	4.4	35.4	-9.3	59.9	-24.5	N/A	16.9	N/A	15.2	-1.7	36.9	-21.7
#34	Language Arts	22.4	24.6	2.2	35.8	11.2	44.6	-8.8	62.7	61.8	-0.9	64.4	2.6	68.4	-4.0
	Mathematics	9.3	23.6	14.3	18.1	-5.5	43.6	-25.5	35.3	30.9	-4.4	64.4	33.5	50.9	13.5
	Science	41.9	49.2	7.3	50.0	0.8	62.1	-12.1	N/A	23.6	N/A	54.2	30.6	43.6	10.6
#40	Language Arts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	83.6	76.6	-7.0	55.3	-21.3	83.6	-28.3
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	41.9	51.2	9.3	69.9	18.7	63.1	6.8
	Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	41.6	N/A	53.4	11.8	58.3	-4.9
Academy II	Language Arts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	22.6	27.9	5.3	15.0	-12.9	47.9	-32.9
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.3	6.9	-0.4	9.0	2.1	26.9	-17.9
	Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	13.7	N/A	12.3	-1.4	33.7	-21.4

¹As reported in the Revised January 2001 State Summary Book

²As reported in the January 2001 State Summary Book

³As reported in the Elementary School Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance (Report Printed 8/06/01)

⁴As reported in the December 1999 State Summary Book

⁵As reported in the January 2001 State Summary Book

⁶As reported in the Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance (Report Printed 6/08/01)

COHORT III SCHOOLS

School	Subject	ESPA							GEPA						
		May 1999 ¹	May 2000 ²	Diff. 1999 to 2000	April 2001 ³	Diff. 2000 to 2001	2001 Target	Diff. From Target	March 1999 ⁴	March 2000 ⁵	Diff. 1999 to 2000	March 2001 ⁶	Diff. 2000 to 2001	2001 Target	Diff. From Target
#5	Language Arts	57.1	50.0	-7.1	86.5	36.5	62.5	24.0	89.6	90.9	1.3	93.5	2.6	90.9	2.6
	Mathematics	64.3	50.0	-14.3	37.3	-12.7	64.3	-27.0	72.4	84.8	12.4	96.8	12.0	84.8	12.0
	Science	83.4	80.9	-2.5	84.8	3.9	83.4	1.4	N/A	63.6	N/A	77.4	13.8	69.3	8.1
#6	Language Arts	57.1	43.1	-14.0	67.7	24.6	59.1	8.6	93.7	89.4	-4.3	93.2	3.8	93.7	-0.5
	Mathematics	68.2	47.1	-21.1	57.6	10.5	68.2	-10.6	65.3	61.8	-3.5	83.8	22.0	68.4	15.4
	Science	83.5	81.4	-2.1	79.8	-1.6	83.5	-3.7	N/A	67.1	N/A	85.1	18.0	71.1	14.0
#8	Language Arts	50.4	31.3	-19.1	57.4	26.1	51.3	6.1	85.2	80.5	-4.7	71.8	-8.7	85.2	-13.4
	Mathematics	62.6	58.8	-3.8	49.2	-9.6	66.9	-17.7	67.9	54.8	-13.1	56.5	1.7	67.9	-11.4
	Science	74.7	76.5	1.8	76.0	-0.5	76.5	-0.5	N/A	54.8	N/A	63.6	8.8	64.9	-1.3
#9	Language Arts	30.4	53.3	22.9	70.8	17.5	64.2	6.6	69.4	70.4	1.0	66.7	-3.7	72.7	-6.0
	Mathematics	39.2	62.2	23.0	54.1	-8.1	68.6	-14.5	34.3	48.1	13.8	36.7	-11.4	61.6	-24.9
	Science	54.5	80.0	25.5	83.3	3.3	80.0	3.3	N/A	25.9	N/A	50.0	24.1	45.9	4.1
#11	Language Arts	56.6	40.3	-16.3	78.1	37.8	57.7	20.4	82.5	73.3	-9.2	81.4	8.1	82.5	-1.1
	Mathematics	69.3	65.0	-4.3	58.9	-6.1	70.0	-11.1	67.5	71.1	3.6	79.5	8.4	73.1	6.4
	Science	84.2	83.1	-1.1	76.7	-6.4	84.2	-7.5	N/A	68.8	N/A	70.5	1.7	71.9	-1.4
#12	Language Arts	44.4	24.4	-20.0	49.0	24.6	44.4	4.6	59.1	60.0	0.9	63.6	3.6	67.5	-3.9
	Mathematics	24.4	31.0	6.6	19.2	-11.8	51.0	-31.8	17.8	14.3	-3.5	27.3	13.0	34.3	-7.0
	Science	53.4	72.1	18.7	55.8	-16.3	73.6	-17.8	N/A	25.7	N/A	50.0	24.3	45.7	4.3

¹As reported in the Revised January 2001 State Summary Book

²As reported in the January 2001 State Summary Book

³As reported in the Elementary School Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance (Report Printed 8/06/01)

⁴As reported in the December 1999 State Summary Book

⁵As reported in the January 2001 State Summary Book

⁶As reported in the Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance (Report Printed 6/08/01)

COHORT III SCHOOLS (cont'd.)

School	Subject	ESPA							GEPA						
		May 1999 ¹	May 2000 ²	Diff. 1999 to 2000	April 2001 ³	Diff. 2000 to 2001	2001 Target	Diff. From Target	March 1999 ⁴	March 2000 ⁵	Diff. 1999 to 2000	March 2001 ⁶	Diff. 2000 to 2001	2001 Target	Diff. From Target
#16	Language Arts	48.1	48.5	0.4	79.4	30.9	61.8	17.6	87.6	92.0	4.4	93.3	1.3	92.0	1.3
	Mathematics	66.7	66.7	0.0	47.0	-19.7	70.9	-23.9	62.5	56.0	-6.5	76.7	20.7	65.5	11.2
	Science	92.6	87.9	-4.7	91.1	3.2	92.6	-1.5	N/A	56.0	N/A	83.3	27.3	65.5	17.8
#20	Language Arts	33.3	36.2	2.9	64.2	28.0	55.6	8.6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Mathematics	17.7	30.8	13.1	30.9	0.1	50.8	-19.9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Science	56.5	65.7	9.2	66.7	1.0	70.4	-3.7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
#22	Language Arts	22.4	23.9	1.5	44.1	20.2	43.9	0.2	63.2	61.3	-1.9	48.8	-12.5	68.2	-19.4
	Mathematics	35.9	26.8	-9.1	19.4	-7.4	46.8	-27.4	22.9	22.6	-0.3	43.9	21.3	42.6	1.3
	Science	47.6	49.3	1.7	39.7	-9.6	62.2	-22.5	N/A	14.5	N/A	48.7	34.2	34.5	14.2
#23	Language Arts	27.0	30.8	3.8	64.2	33.4	50.8	13.4	85.6	89.6	4.0	81.7	-7.9	89.6	-7.9
	Mathematics	31.3	54.2	22.9	37.6	-16.6	64.6	-27.0	77.3	73.1	-4.2	85.4	12.3	77.3	8.1
	Science	60.5	75.0	14.5	74.6	-0.4	75.0	-0.4	N/A	70.2	N/A	63.5	-6.7	72.6	-9.1
#24	Language Arts	39.8	36.0	-3.8	59.3	23.3	55.5	3.8	75.3	91.0	15.7	93.2	2.2	91.0	2.2
	Mathematics	26.0	50.6	24.6	28.6	-22.0	62.8	-34.2	52.4	55.0	2.6	72.7	17.7	65.0	7.7
	Science	60.0	72.0	12.0	71.1	-0.9	73.5	-2.4	N/A	58.0	N/A	57.9	-0.1	66.5	-8.6
#25	Language Arts	41.3	39.5	-1.8	75.2	35.7	57.3	17.9	94.7	96.6	1.9	94.6	-2.0	96.6	-2.0
	Mathematics	40.1	56.8	16.7	54.7	-2.1	65.9	-11.2	64.2	78.0	13.8	81.5	3.5	78.0	3.5
	Science	75.4	79.2	3.8	84.6	5.4	79.2	5.4	N/A	80.4	N/A	85.9	5.5	80.4	5.5

¹As reported in the Revised January 2001 State Summary Book

²As reported in the January 2001 State Summary Book

³As reported in the Elementary School Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance (Report Printed 8/06/01)

⁴As reported in the December 1999 State Summary Book

⁵As reported in the January 2001 State Summary Book

⁶As reported in the Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance (Report Printed 6/08/01)

COHORT III SCHOOLS (cont'd.)

School	Subject	ESPA							GEPA						
		May 1999 ¹	May 2000 ²	Diff. 1999 to 2000	April 2001 ³	Diff. 2000 to 2001	2001 Target	Diff. From Target	March 1999 ⁴	March 2000 ⁵	Diff. 1999 to 2000	March 2001 ⁶	Diff. 2000 to 2001	2001 Target	Diff. From Target
#28	Language Arts	45.0	45.7	0.7	71.3	25.6	60.4	10.9	88.3	88.7	0.4	84.0	-4.7	88.7	-4.7
	Mathematics	46.7	61.0	14.3	44.6	-16.4	68.0	-23.4	54.4	52.2	-2.2	60.7	8.5	63.6	-2.9
	Science	83.5	84.9	1.4	74.2	-10.7	84.9	-10.7	N/A	50.7	N/A	78.2	27.5	62.9	15.3
#29	Language Arts	41.3	10.9	-30.4	38.9	28.0	40.4	-1.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Mathematics	39.6	21.8	-17.8	26.0	4.2	41.8	-15.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Science	51.0	43.5	-7.5	51.8	8.3	59.3	-7.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
#33	Language Arts	64.7	77.3	12.6	81.3	4.0	77.3	4.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Mathematics	72.1	81.8	9.7	66.3	-15.5	81.8	-15.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Science	91.2	93.9	2.7	86.3	-7.6	93.9	-7.6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
#37	Language Arts	73.8	61.0	-12.8	84.8	23.8	73.8	11.0	87.2	93.2	6.0	83.4	-9.8	93.2	-9.8
	Mathematics	95.4	78.0	-17.4	84.7	6.7	95.4	-10.7	33.3	40.7	7.4	76.0	35.3	57.9	18.1
	Science	95.4	88.1	-7.3	86.4	-1.7	95.4	-9.0	N/A	49.2	N/A	66.7	17.5	62.1	4.6
#38	Language Arts	49.4	28.3	-21.1	67.9	39.6	49.4	18.5	90.1	86.0	-4.1	76.9	-9.1	90.1	-13.2
	Mathematics	53.9	43.4	-10.5	50.5	7.1	59.2	-8.7	57.6	56.0	-1.6	54.8	-1.2	65.5	-10.7
	Science	85.4	69.6	-15.8	79.8	10.2	85.4	-5.6	N/A	67.8	N/A	65.9	-1.9	71.4	-5.5
#42	Language Arts	61.3	65.6	4.3	71.9	6.3	70.3	1.6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Mathematics	45.1	56.3	11.2	46.9	-9.4	65.7	-18.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Science	74.2	71.9	-2.3	71.9	0.0	74.2	-2.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

¹As reported in the Revised January 2001 State Summary Book

²As reported in the January 2001 State Summary Book

³As reported in the Elementary School Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance (Report Printed 8/06/01)

⁴As reported in the December 1999 State Summary Book

⁵As reported in the January 2001 State Summary Book

⁶As reported in the Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance (Report Printed 6/08/01)

COHORT III SCHOOLS (cont'd.)

School	Subject	ESPA							GEPA						
		May 1999 ¹	May 2000 ²	Diff. 1999 to 2000	April 2001 ³	Diff. 2000 to 2001	2001 Target	Diff. From Target	March 1999 ⁴	March 2000 ⁵	Diff. 1999 to 2000	March 2001 ⁶	Diff. 2000 to 2001	2001 Target	Diff. From Target
Academy I	Language Arts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	67.0	57.7	-9.3	64.8	7.1	67.0	-2.2
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	61.0	50.9	-10.1	61.3	10.4	63.0	-1.7
	Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.9	N/A	60.2	9.3	63.0	-2.8

¹As reported in the Revised January 2001 State Summary Book

²As reported in the January 2001 State Summary Book

³As reported in the Elementary School Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance (Report Printed 8/06/01)

⁴As reported in the December 1999 State Summary Book

⁵As reported in the January 2001 State Summary Book

⁶As reported in the Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance (Report Printed 6/08/01)

Staff Accountability (page 50)

- The district's accountability system of rewards and sanctions was submitted to the Commissioner on June 1, 1999, and is included within.
- Continue implementation of an instructional staff appraisal system as needed to provide a comprehensive district-wide performance evaluative tool based upon the requirements of each position and the agreed upon job targets.
- Maintain a database to track instructional and support staff members who demonstrate less than satisfactory performance.

Successful



Unsuccessful



Explanation of Success:

On June 1, 1999, the district submitted its *Accountability Plan* to the Commissioner of Education. The *Plan* represented what was, in effect, a performance-based accountability system which coupled rewards and sanctions for schools and school administrators with indicators of student progress in academic and behavioral areas.

For the 2000-01 school year, the *Plan* was implemented as designed. Specifically:

- Teacher plan books were monitored for adherence to the Core Curriculum Content Standards;
- Detailed reports on school performance were sent to principals at the outset of the school year;
- School-level analysis of test scores was incorporated into the WSR planning process;
- School Report Cards were prepared and disseminated;
- Recognition ceremonies for successful students/schools/staff members were held at numerous Board of Education Meetings, special assemblies and public presentations throughout the school year;
- HSPT and GEPA incentives were provided to students;
- Communication with parents was extensive and ongoing;

- Numerous parent recognition receptions, ceremonies and other events, by district and school, were conducted;
- Appropriate sanctions were continued, including withholding of increments, additional training requirements, etc.;
- PIPs were developed for all instructional/administrative staff members;
- Peer mentors were available for teaching staff; and,
- The Principals' Institute and Principal Mentoring Program were continued, and the assistance of developers was available, as implementation of selected WSR models proceeded.

Data generated from various State and district academic assessments (ESPA, GEPA, HSPT, midterm and final examinations, and student attendance and dropout data) were analyzed on two levels. At the district level, strengths and weaknesses in student performance were used to inform the development of specific strategies in the district *Strategic Plan*, especially in areas of curriculum modification, staff development, resource allocation, and supervisory involvement with instruction. At the school level, principals were provided with an analysis of their data at the outset of the school year, and were expected to develop school-level plans to address areas of need. The lowest performing schools were visited (throughout 1999-00) by an administrative/supervisory team which made recommendations for improvement through a Corrective Action Plan implemented in 2000-01.

Also during the 2000-01 school year, district involvement with school-level accountability became more focused on technical assistance and support than monitoring. Plans that had been developed for the lowest performing schools were still being implemented, but with each school having adopted its own Whole School Reform Model, both the educational planning and monitoring functions were increasingly being generated at the school level.

This has been a positive development. School staff appear to have developed far more internal than externally imposed accountability, and have become more directly involved in the development of student improvement strategies at their respective schools. Anecdotal reports indicate that they are strongly motivated by the district's support and assistance provided by their supervisors, building administrators and Site Management Teams. For these reasons, we have decided to review our *Accountability Plan* to assure that all sections remain relevant, workable and appropriate, given our new focus on the implementation of WSR models in all schools. While this review progresses, the activities of our original *Plan* will continue.

SECTION II: COMPLIANCE

ATTAINMENT OF CORRECTIVE ACTION PLANS

#	INDICATOR	STATUS	EXPECTATION
5.1	Pupil Attendance	Compliant	<p>Final attendance numbers for the 2000-01 school year indicate that the district has exceeded the mandate (90%) set by the State and, district wide, we have improved by 0.1% from 1999-2000. Every school except one is over the required 90%. In light of the large increase recorded for 1999-00 (3.7%) when the Student Attendance Policy was first implemented, this additional gain is significant.</p> <p><i>See Summary Student Behavior Indicators on page 101.</i></p>
5.2	Dropouts	Compliant	<p>Jersey City's dropout rate for the 2000-01 school year (9.5%) met the State Standard and bettered its 1999-00 rate (9.92%) by .42 of a percentage point.</p> <p>This improvement is particularly noteworthy in light of the district's high level of monitoring and enforcement of a more stringent student attendance policy. The attendance policy intentionally employs both incentives for attending school and consequences for not attending school. This blend of approaches is perceived as important in terms of our goal to reduce the dropout rate and our goal to increase the student attendance rate. For the 2001-02 school year, the district intends to continue this two-pronged attendance improvement/dropout prevention policy.</p> <p><i>See Summary Student Behavior Indicators on page 103. Our District Analysis—fifteen together (Cohorts I, II and III) is available through the Office of Programs/Services.</i></p>
7.1	State Aid	Compliant	<p>The district has met the indicator as evidenced by providing the necessary data by the dates specified by the Department of Education with no adjustments in the current year's (2000-01) aid data, and no adjustments in the previous four year's data (1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, and 1999-00).</p>
7.2	Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP)	Compliant	<p>The district has met this indicator as evidenced by the monthly submission of Board of Education financial actions to the County Superintendent of Schools.</p> <p>The district will continue to submit to the County Superintendent each month a report of financial items presented to the Board of Education at its public meeting.</p>

#	INDICATOR	STATUS	EXPECTATION
7.3	Overexpenditure of Funds	Compliant	<p>The district has met this indicator as evidenced by the CAFR that reflects the receipt of capital reimbursement by the City of Jersey City. However, the City's funding practices include temporary notes. GAAP does not recognize temporary funding and, therefore, the CAFR includes a recommendation that the City permanently fund all improvement authorizations. The district will continue to reconcile funded balances with the City of Jersey City.</p> <p>The monthly A148 and A149 will reflect the receipt of capital funds reimbursed by the City of Jersey City.</p>
7.4	Annual Audit and Recommendations	Compliant	<p>The district has met this indicator as evidenced by the Board of Education public meeting agendas. It is also evident by the submission to the County Superintendent and CAP status report to the Department of Education.</p> <p>In addition, the district is the recipient of the Governmental Finance Officer's Association Certificate of Excellence in Financial Reporting for the June 1998 and June 1999 CAFRs. The June 1999 CAFR also received the Association of School Business Officials' International Certificate of Excellence.</p> <p>The district will continue to submit a CAP status report to the Department of Education each June 30.</p>
7.5	Transportation Contracts	Compliant	<p>The district has met this indicator. The district's bid specifications are submitted to the County Office for review prior to advertising. As routes are established, they are also submitted to the County Office. All awarded contracts are filed with the County Office. Contracts for emergency routes are awarded for no longer than 90 calendar days in accordance with 6:21-16.7(b)4.</p> <p>The district will continue to routinely seek County Office approval on all bid specifications prior to bidding. The district will continue to forward all contracts or contract renewals to the County Superintendent of Schools for approval in accordance with 6A27-9.9(b).</p>
7.6	Health & Safety	Compliant	<p>All school buildings will be evaluated with the health and safety <u>Checklist Report</u> annually by the maintenance supervisor responsible for that building.</p> <p>Every school building was audited using the health and safety checklist. Every building is compliant in the 100% categories. Copies of those checklists, signed by the maintenance supervisor and the Superintendent, are on file in the Business Office.</p>

#	INDICATOR	STATUS	EXPECTATION
7.7	Comprehensive Maintenance Plan	Compliant	<p>The original plan, developed and adopted at the July 1999 Board meeting, has been modified to distinguish between facility management plan items and true maintenance items. The modified plan was presented to the Board at the October 2000 meeting and approved. Items yet to be performed by professional consultants are being identified and will be bid out in the 2001-02 school year.</p> <p>This indicator is currently being addressed by the district. District custodial and maintenance personnel addressed parts of the plan in 1999-00 and continue to address the plan in the current year. Engineers contracted by the Treasury addressed health, safety and life cycle issues. The revision of the plan to separate FMP issues and annual maintenance issues will allow this indicator to be more fully implemented.</p>
7.8	Facility Master Plan/Substandard Classrooms	Not Compliant	<p>The district continues to lease classroom space due to overcrowding. Additionally, with the Abbott preschool mandate, the district also leases forty-nine (49) trailers for the preschool program for four-year olds. Eight (8) additional classrooms will be leased for preschool facilities in the coming year. These trailers have virtually eliminated the little outdoor space available on many school sites. A copy of all leased space and the purpose for each is on file in the Business Administrator's Office.</p> <p>The Facilities Management Plan includes thirty (30) new schools. Fifteen (15) of these are Early Childhood Centers. The FMP was approved in February 2001. The district has set forth thirty-six (36) first-year priorities and submitted project requests to NJDOE for each. Twenty-six (26) of the project priorities are land or building acquisition; three (3) are for new schools; six (6) are for renovations/additions at existing schools; one (1) was for additional temporary classrooms for preschool. Project numbers have been assigned by NJDOE for the priority projects. We are now awaiting the transfer of projects from NJDOE to NJEDA so that necessary services can be procured in order to begin work on the projects.</p> <p>We hope to commence negotiations for the purchase of Summit Plaza, where P.S. 42 is housed, as soon as NJEDA can begin work. Unfortunately, despite several urgent requests to NJDOE regarding one potential site for an Early Childhood Center, we lost the opportunity to purchase the site when the owner, having waited for more than one year, sold the property to other interested buyers.</p> <p>We will not be compliant until all leased spaces are abandoned with all trailers removed from school sites and the new schools that make up the district's Facilities Management Plan have been built.</p>

#	INDICATOR	STATUS	EXPECTATION
8.1 (e)	Special Education Programs and Services	Not Compliant	<p>The district received the May 2001 Monitoring Report at the beginning of September 2001. It is currently being reviewed, and the required CAPs are being developed. When this process is completed, the Corrective Action Plans will be submitted for Board of Education approval and subsequent submission to the Hudson County Office.</p> <p>A program review was conducted during May 2001. The district is in the process of reviewing the document and developing the required Corrective Action Plans. The status of other Corrective Action Plans that are currently in effect are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>District-Wide Inclusion Education Plan</u>: The district's focus continues to be to make every school an inclusive education site by providing the full continuum of Resource Program services in each building, thereby ensuring that students have the opportunity to be educated in the least restrictive environment as mandated by both state and federal code. Many school-level inclusion plans have made provisions for an inclusion teacher at every grade, and the district is moving in this direction district wide. In addition to the expansion of the Resource Program, special education students are being supported in their general education programs through the assistance of Project Raise, the Behavioral Support Program, the Adapted Physical Education Program and the Art Therapy Program. • <u>Special Education Reading Program</u>: The special education literacy program, Project Raise, is now implemented in nine schools throughout the district. Five of the schools have twenty-five or more students receiving services from the Reading Specialists. The program has grown to include nine reading teachers. • <u>Preschool Inclusion Plan</u>: The Adapted Physical Education Program is an outgrowth of the district-wide Preschool Inclusion Plan. It provides preschool students with developmentally appropriate fine and gross motor skill development. Services are provided to preschoolers in the following settings: general education, co-teaching (general and special education), preschool disabilities special classes and inclusion. The district provides two Adapted Physical Education teachers who currently service fifty-one classrooms distributed across thirteen buildings. The program incorporates parental involvement for skill development and

#	INDICATOR	STATUS	EXPECTATION
			<p>enhancement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Behavioral Support Program</u>: A cadre of trained Licensed Clinical Social Workers (LCSW) provide counseling, support and consultation services to students currently enrolled in district level (school based) Behavioral Disabilities and Multiple Disabilities special classes. School staff and the parents of the students are included in the delivery of services model. This program allows students with significant emotional problems to remain in general education buildings with the possibility of increased inclusion experiences. The aim of the program is also to reduce the suspension rate of these special education students while teaching them appropriate adaptive/social/coping skills so that they can function in a general education program. Ten LCSWs are providing services in eighteen schools, each LCSW is typically assigned four to five special classes. • <u>Art Therapy Program</u>: Art therapy services are provided to both special education and general education students in six schools throughout the district. The focus of this program is to develop emotional awareness and coping skills for students with a history of poor emotional expression skills. Students are provided an opportunity to release pent-up feelings in a constructive manner, increasing their success in a general education building. • <u>District-wide Suspension CAP</u>: The district was required to develop a Corrective Action Plan to ensure that special education students' rights would not be abridged by exceeding the ten-day suspension limit without IEP intervention. The CAP requires that the cumulative number of suspension days be maintained and monitored for all special education students. This is achieved by including this information on the Suspension Report Form and the Cumulative Suspension Report for Special Education Students Form. The latter is maintained in the student's main special education file. The CAP requires that the principal confer with the CST case manager prior to instituting any additional suspensions once the student has amassed seven days of suspension per school year. Training on this issue has been provided to all principals and Child Study Team members (including Speech/Language Specialist).

Summary Student Behavior Indicators

ATTENDANCE RATE (%)														
School	AVERAGE RATE AT YEAR END (6/30)						3-YEAR AVERAGE RATE					2000-01 3-Year Average Benchmark	Actual 3-Year Average For: 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01	Difference from Benchmark
	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	For: 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96	For: 1994-95, 1995-96, 1996-97	For: 1995-96, 1996-97, 1997-98	For: 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99	For: 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00			
P.S. #1			88.3	87.7	91.3	93.2			N/A	88.0 ^a	89.1	90.0	90.7	0.7
P.S. #3	93.2	93.6	93.9	92.2	94.8	95.6	92.1	93.1	93.6	93.2	93.6	93.6	94.2	0.6
P.S. #5	93.4	94.4	95.0	92.3	95.4	95.8	92.8	93.7	94.3	93.9	94.2	94.3	94.5	0.2
P.S. #6	93.5	93.5	94.1	94.0	95.4	95.4	93.0	93.4	93.7	93.9	94.5	94.5	94.9	0.4
P.S. #8	91.9	92.3	93.0	91.0	94.2	93.7	91.0	91.9	92.4	92.1	92.7	92.7	93.0	0.3
P.S. #9	90.5	91.4	91.7	89.2	93.2	93.1	90.0	90.7	91.2	90.8	91.4	91.4	91.8	0.4
P.S. #11	93.6	93.2	93.9	91.3	94.7	94.8	92.8	93.3	93.6	92.8	93.3	93.6	93.6	0.0
P.S. #12	89.4	92.0	90.7	89.6	91.6	93.0	89.0	90.5	90.7	90.8	90.6	90.8	91.4	0.6
P.S. #14	90.3	92.6	92.0	88.0	91.9	91.7	90.0	91.0	91.6	90.9	90.6	91.6	90.5	-1.1
P.S. #15	90.3	91.4	92.4	91.0	92.2	92.9	88.7	90.6	91.4	91.6	91.9	91.9	92.0	0.1
P.S. #16	92.4	93.1	94.3	93.1	95.5	95.2	92.1	92.5	93.3	93.5	94.3	94.3	94.6	0.3
P.S. #17	93.3	94.0	94.0	92.9	93.9	94.2	92.2	93.3	93.8	93.6	93.6	93.8	93.7	-0.1
P.S. #20	92.3	93.7	92.4	90.2	94.0	93.7	91.6	92.6	92.8	92.1	92.2	92.8	92.6	-0.2
P.S. #22	91.1	93.1	91.6	91.2	92.7	92.5	90.6	91.3	91.9	92.0	91.8	92.0	92.1	0.1
P.S. #23	92.0	92.0	93.1	91.0	93.1	93.1	90.8	91.5	92.4	92.0	92.4	92.4	92.4	0.0
P.S. #24	91.0	92.4	91.6	89.7	93.5	93.5	90.0	91.6	91.7	91.2	91.6	91.7	92.2	0.5
P.S. #25	94.4	94.7	94.9	92.6	95.3	95.9	94.0	94.5	94.7	94.1	94.3	94.7	94.6	-0.1
P.S. #27	94.0	94.9	94.8	93.1	95.7	95.5	93.7	94.3	94.6	94.3	94.5	94.6	94.8	0.2
P.S. #28	93.3	93.5	93.9	91.9	94.6	93.8	92.7	93.3	93.6	93.1	93.5	93.6	93.4	-0.2
P.S. #29	91.2	92.0	92.3	90.4	93.4	92.7	90.5	91.3	91.8	91.6	92.0	92.0	92.2	0.2
P.S. #30	91.7	92.7	93.3	90.3	92.3	93.3	91.7	92.1	92.6	92.1	92.0	92.6	92.0	-0.6
P.S. #31	87.0	87.9	87.2	84.0	90.2	91.9	89.0	88.0	87.4	86.4	87.1	90.0	88.7	-1.3

^aA 2-year average since, at the close of the 1998-99 school year, P.S. #1 had only been in existence for two years.

ATTENDANCE RATE (%)

School	AVERAGE RATE AT YEAR END (6/30)						3-YEAR AVERAGE RATE					2000-01 3-Year Average Benchmark	Actual 3-Year Average For: 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01	Difference from Benchmark
	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	For: 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96	For: 1994-95, 1995-96, 1996-97	For: 1995-96, 1996-97, 1997-98	For: 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99	For: 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00			
P.S. #33	91.6	92.2	94.2	93.7	95.0	95.0	92.8	92.3	92.7	93.4	94.3	94.3	94.6	0.3
P.S. #34	90.7	92.0	92.6	90.6	93.1	94.0	90.6	91.2	91.8	91.7	92.1	92.1	92.6	0.5
P.S. #37	91.5	91.8	91.6	91.2	92.7	93.8	91.0	91.2	91.6	91.5	91.8	91.8	92.6	0.8
P.S. #38	94.2	94.9	94.9	93.6	95.9	96.0	93.9	94.4	94.7	94.5	94.8	94.8	95.2	0.4
P.S. #39	90.0	91.0	89.7	87.8	91.6	93.1	88.9	90.1	90.2	89.5	89.7	90.2	90.8	0.6
P.S. #40	92.2	92.7	91.7	89.4	93.1	92.8	91.8	92.4	92.2	91.3	91.4	92.4	91.8	-0.6
P.S. #41	91.0	92.1	92.1	90.0	92.9	92.8	91.1	91.9	91.7	91.4	91.7	91.9	91.9	0.0
P.S. #42	92.6	94.5	94.0	92.0	95.2	95.6	92.5	93.3	93.7	93.5	93.7	93.7	94.3	0.6
D.H.S.	81.3	84.0	84.7	83.1	91.0	90.8	80.7	81.5	83.3	83.9	86.3	90.0	88.3	-1.7
F.H.S.	84.7	89.1	88.9	84.4	92.4	91.2	84.3	85.9	87.6	87.5	88.6	90.0	89.3	-0.7
Liberty					93.9	91.7					N/A	93.9 ^b	92.8 ^b	-1.1
L.H.S.	77.3	84.5	83.9	82.7	90.0	90.6	77.9	79.5	81.9	83.7	85.5	90.0	87.8	-2.2
M.A.H.S.	96.3	97.0	96.8	95.9	97.7	97.3	95.7	96.2	96.7	96.6	96.8	96.8	97.0	0.2
S.H.S.	72.4	81.0	82.4	81.0	88.5	87.6	73.6	75.6	78.6	81.5	84.0	87.0	85.7	-1.3
R.D.S.	90.4	90.1	90.9	83.3	92.3	92.3	88.7	90.2	90.5	88.1	88.8	90.5	89.3	-1.2
Academy I	85.6	92.3	91.4	89.7	92.9	93.7	N/A	89.0 ^c	89.8	91.1	91.3	91.3	92.1	0.8
Academy II				82.9	90.3	91.1				N/A	86.6 ^d	90.0	88.1	-1.9
DISTRICT	89.4	91.3	91.4	89.5	93.2	93.3	88.9	89.9	90.7	90.7	91.4	92.0	92.0	0.0

^bBoth the benchmark and the actual average provided for Liberty High School are based on 2-year averages, as Liberty High School opened in September 1999 and has only been in existence for two years.

^cA 2-year average since, at the close of the 1996-97 school year, Academy I had only been in existence for two years.

^dA 2-year average since, at the close of the 1999-00 school year, Academy II had only been in existence for two years.

Summary Student Behavior Indicators

DROPOUT RATE¹ (16 year olds & over)								
School	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01 Benchmark	2000-01 Actual	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #1			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A (primary school)	N/A	N/A
P.S. #3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #6	0.0	40.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #8	2.9	0.0	14.3	40.0	11.1	Meet State Standard	0.0	Met State Standard
P.S. #9	20.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #11	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	Meet State Standard	10.0	Met State Standard
P.S. #12	38.8	0.0	40.0	0.0	28.6	Meet State Standard	33.3	-23.3
P.S. #14	14.2	7.7	0.0	14.3	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #15	7.4	36.4	15.4	9.1	12.5	Meet State Standard	0.0	Met State Standard
P.S. #16	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #17	12.5	8.7	8.0	5.6	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #20	5.5	25.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	N/A (primary school)	N/A	N/A
P.S. #22	10.5	0.0	8.3	0.0	20.0	Meet State Standard	0.0	Met State Standard
P.S. #23	18.5	20.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #24	18.7	40.0	10.0	12.5	0.0	Maintain State Standard	18.2	-8.2
P.S. #25	0.0	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #27	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	Meet State Standard	0.0	Met State Standard
P.S. #28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	Meet State Standard	0.0	Met State Standard

¹Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16-year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

DROPOUT RATE¹ (16 year olds & over)								
School	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01 Benchmark	2000-01 Actual	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #29	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A (primary school)	N/A	N/A
P.S. #30	6.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	N/A (primary school)	N/A	N/A
P.S. #33	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A (primary school)	N/A	N/A
P.S. #34	14.2	20.0	20.0	25.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #37	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #39	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	66.7	-56.7
P.S. #40	0.0	50.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	Maintain State Standard	5.9	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #41	4.8	0.0	14.3	9.1	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #42	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A (primary school)	N/A	N/A
Academy I	N/A	37.5	10.0	21.4	10.5	Meet State Standard	5.9	Met State Standard
Academy II				15.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	13.3	-3.3
D.H.S.	12.9	16.5	14.6	14.0	14.1	Meet State Standard	11.5	-1.5
F.H.S.	5.4	6.3	0.7	1.8	8.3	Maintain State Standard	9.1	Maintained State Standard
L.A.H.S.					0.0	Maintain State Standard	1.5	Maintained State Standard
L.H.S.	20.7	23.2	15.8	11.5	9.6	Maintain State Standard	10.1	-0.1
M.A.H.S.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
S.H.S.	23.8	17.3	9.2	10.1	11.2	Meet State Standard	10.6	-0.6
District	13.27	14.6	10.0	9.3	9.92	Maintain State Standard	9.5	Maintained State Standard

¹Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16-year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

**SECTION III:
COMMUNITY AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT**

Involving Parents in the Education of Their Children (page 78)

Project PREP – Conceived and established **Programs to Recruit and Empower Parents**, a comprehensive, multi-faceted series of district and school-level programs and activities which have significantly elevated the quantity and degree of participation by parents in the educational process and serves as a model for replication across the State and nation. A sampling of programs under this umbrella include:

- **Parents As Partners Conference** – a full day annual conference at NJCU with over 1,000 parents in attendance;
- **Mini Courses** – six-week courses in self improvement and elementary curriculum areas;
- **The Communicator** – a monthly parent newsletter providing relevant and timely information (winner of NJSBA Award for Communications);
- **Parent Calendar and Resource Directory** – annual comprehensive document which provides details about every program and event throughout the school district;
- **Parent Liaisons** – a parent advocate assigned to every school to represent the interests of the parents in program and policy decisions;
- **Community Aides** – assigned at every school to serve as liaisons between home and school;
- **Parent Resource Teacher** – provides technical support to parents at the school level;
- **Bi-Monthly Chat Sessions** – meetings with parents and community members held at geographically convenient locations throughout the district to hear concerns and solicit input regarding programs and services;
- **Regional and National Conferences** – parents are provided opportunities to attend/make presentations at parent involvement conferences across the region and nation;
- **Laptop Loaner Program** for parents and middle grade students through the 21st Century Community Learning Centers wherein parents from each participating school collaborate on a research project for presentation to the students;
- **Safe Passage Program** (NJ Best Practice) – parent volunteers line the streets surrounding their schools and ensure that the students get to and from home and school safely;
- **Parents Organizing Parents Strategy (POPS)** – The Community Foundation worked with district staff to make this strategy available to parents in Jersey City and Elizabeth during the 1999-00 school year. Through this program, over one hundred (100) parents were trained either by the Princeton Center for Leadership Training or through district turnkey team leader trainers. The purpose of this program is to bring together diverse groups of parents—recent immigrants and long-time residents—to collaborate on projects in the community which will foster school/community involvement and serve as an example to their children. Continuation is planned for 2000-01.

- **Parental Involvement Task Force** – Formed during the summer of 1999, this group met monthly and produced a questionnaire which was distributed to parents of all Jersey City Public School children. Results were tabulated and shared with all principals and appropriate central office personnel for follow-up during the 2000-01 school year.
- **Parent Grants** – The district's commitment to fostering parental involvement is evidenced in the number of grants (of up to \$5,000) awarded to parent and community groups to develop programs of interest to parents, which meet the educational needs of the students. During the 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-00 school years, 49 grants totaling \$194,000, 60 grants totaling \$187,670 and 32 grants totaling \$163,703 respectively were awarded.
- **Parent/Community Survey** – In May 1996, the district conducted a *Parent/Community Survey* of all elementary school households in the district to assess public perception of the effectiveness of our educational program. Data were compiled in a number of areas including Overall School Operation, District Leadership, School Leadership, School Environment/Climate, and Discipline. That *Survey* was very successful in that it provided insights that were helpful for district planning purposes. In order to provide the district with comparison data regarding parent/community perceptions, the *Survey* was repeated in May 1998 and again in June 2000. In an effort to determine where improvement or regression might have occurred over the course of these surveys, the district prepared "*A Comparison of Survey Results*" – a document which illustrates the increase/decrease in percent (based on completed surveys) from one survey to the next. The *Survey* results were extremely positive. They indicated that the community has a greater degree of satisfaction with all dimensions of the programs offered since the May 1996 *Survey*. Nevertheless, we will not "rest on our laurels," but will continue to seek higher levels of "customer satisfaction."
- **ASPIRA** – School- and district-level workshops that are available to interested parents in schools across the district.

Successful



Unsuccessful



Explanation of Success:

District wide, the level of parent involvement increased by approximately 25 percent. This is due largely to the emphasis placed on the value of parental input. In addition to the programs and activities identified above, several new initiatives were implemented to inform and involve parents in the educational process. Some of these included bi-monthly chat sessions, a parent handbook, a summer activity calendar, the FEB (Families Enjoying Books) Project, and the

Ambassador Program. School-level administrators were directed to provide access and information to parents and submit plans detailing activities that would promote same.

Involving Community-Based Organizations in Support of the Delivery of a Thorough and Efficient Education
(page 81)

- **Interagency Task Force** – Representation from every community-based organization and government agency in the county, as well as from several businesses and industries to assure that students/parents are aware of, and have access to, health and social services, employment and training opportunities, and a variety of other support services such as mentoring, field trip sponsorship, tutoring, internships/apprenticeships, cultural and recreational activities.
- **21st Century Careers Initiative (Project Director)** – Established 15 Career Magnet Tech Prep Programs through partnerships with the business community and higher education
- **Opportunity Knocks 2 (OK2) Scholarship Program** – Facilitated the establishment of a scholarship program which guarantees payment of all costs for attendance at Hudson County Community College for graduates of the Classes of 2001 and 2002.
- **Adult Education Program** – Designed and established a comprehensive academic and vocational program that awards secondary diplomas to over 500 adult learners annually and serves an additional 5,000 annually.
- **Project LIFT Off (Learning Is A Family Thing)** – Hosted at Newport Mall each year during the week prior to the opening of school to highlight and promote the many district programs and services and provide an opportunity for families new to the district to register their children on site.
- **College Collaboration** – Begun during the 1998-99 school year, this initiative continues the dialogue between the Jersey City Public Schools and institutions of higher learning. Four subcommittees addressing areas of professional development, high school college partnerships, school internships/field experiences, and student teaching met regularly during the 1999-00 school year. Resulting projects include a service learning (tutoring/mentoring) program whereby college students have assisted in public school classrooms; training of a cadre of prospective cooperating teachers (selected by principals as outstanding educators); and, sharing of the Jersey City Public School District's teacher evaluation form with college professors to assist in their preparation of future teachers.

Successful



Unsuccessful



Explanation of Success:

Interagency Task Force

Representatives from community-based organizations and government agencies in the county, as well as from several businesses and industries met monthly to exchange information and jointly assist the school district in notifying students and their parents of opportunities within the community addressing the issues of health, social services, employment, and training opportunities for both the students and their families. Parents were notified of events and organizations that offered support to the family or individual child such as mentoring with Big Brothers, Big Sisters, health fair with "Stand For Children," employment opportunities with various job fairs, etc. In addition, opportunities existed for students to receive services in their buildings such as tutoring for elementary children through AmeriCorps, decision making through Girl Scouts, etc.

21st Century Careers Initiative (Project Director)

The business community continued to provide access and resources to students in pursuit of the skills necessary to be prepared for positions in their respective industries. Students followed the curriculum offerings appropriate to completion of the Tech Prep option.

Opportunity Knocks 2 (OK2) Scholarship Program

Jersey City Public Schools and Hudson County Community College entered into a collaborative agreement to provide a scholarship program, Opportunity Knocks 2 (OK2), to the graduates of the Classes of 2001 and 2002. **OK2** Scholarship Program guarantees payment for all costs associated with attending and completing a program at Hudson County Community College. Parents, students and staff were advised of this program and many of the Class of 2001 will be attending Hudson County Community College in the fall of 2001. Our students now recognize and can aspire to attend a college program even though their families may not be able to afford to send them. Higher education is now a realistic goal.

Adult Education Program

The Adult Education Program awarded 523 secondary diplomas to adult learners after completing a rigorous comprehensive academic and vocational program. Additional students attended the program and are improving their skills as they approach graduation during the 2001-02 school year.

Project LIFT Off (Learning is a Family Thing)

Newport Center Mall hosted the second Project LIFT Off (Learning is a Family Thing) during the week prior to the opening of school. Parents were able to register their child(ren) at the mall and ensure that their son(s) and/or daughter(s) could begin on the first day of school with their peers. Over 500 children were registered at Project LIFT Off. The community and parents were also able to investigate any number of the programs, services or initiatives offered by the district. District personnel, including instructional and supervisory staff, were available to address any questions, concerns or comments of the general community, as well as the parents. Project LIFT Off (Learning is a Family Thing) proved to be an excellent vehicle for exposing families to the offerings in the Jersey City Public Schools.

College Collaboration

Tutors working in Extended Day Programs, specialized course offerings for staff, parent training, ITV, use of facilities, college-level courses given to high school students, and student teacher placement are some of the activities of note that resulted from college collaborations.

Strengthening and Refining the Role of the State-Operated School Board in District Policymaking (page 83)

The Board will meet on a regular basis to develop a policy manual.

- Four sections (Series 1000-4000) have been adopted: *Community Relations; Administration; Business and Noninstructional Operations*; and, *Instructional and Support Personnel*.
- The Board is in the process of reviewing a set of policies on the 5000 Series, *Pupils*.
- The Board is planning to complete the process by the addition of three additional series (6000, 7000 and 9000): *Instruction; Construction, Remodeling and Renovation*; and, *Bylaws of the Board*.
- The Superintendent has given policy decisions to the Board—i.e., alternative education plans in regard to Liberty Alternative High School, Infinity High School, final exam exemption at the high school level, CISCO Magnet School, to name a few.
- At its October meeting, the Board adopted a Code of Ethics to guide Board Members and Senior Staff.

Successful



Unsuccessful



Explanation of Success:

The Board completed the development of a policy manual. The Board adopted the 5000 Series in February 2001, had a first reading of the 6000, 7000 and 9000 Series at the Board Meeting on June 21, 2001, and adopted a code of ethical and professional conduct on June 21, 2001.

APPENDIX A

**Summary Student Performance Indicators:
HIGH SCHOOL PROFICIENCY TEST (HSPT)**

DICKINSON HIGH SCHOOL

11th Grade HSPT	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	Difference 1999-00 to 2000-01	2000-01 Benchmark	Difference from Benchmark
Reading (%)	71.7	71.2	81.5	74.6	82.5	74.8	-7.7	85.0	-10.2
Math (%)	83.0	85.3	84.2	93.2	93.7	84.8	-8.9	93.7	-8.9
Writing (%)	84.9	82.4	83.6	89.5	90.4	90.3	-0.1	90.4	-0.1

= Met or Exceeded State Standard

FERRIS HIGH SCHOOL

11th Grade HSPT	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	Difference 1999-00 to 2000-01	2000-01 Benchmark	Difference from Benchmark
Reading (%)	62.8	60.5	70.6	55.6	60.9	74.6	13.7	73.0	1.6
Math (%)	70.3	67.1	64.5	72.9	73.3	81.5	8.2	79.2	2.3
Writing (%)	77.6	67.8	74.2	78.6	77.0	92.6	15.6	85.0	7.6

= Met or Exceeded State Standard

LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL

11th Grade HSPT	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	Difference 1999-00 to 2000-01	2000-01 Benchmark	Difference from Benchmark
Reading (%)	63.4	60.0	68.4	67.3	72.5	55.4	-17.1	78.8	-23.4
Math (%)	61.6	65.8	58.7	67.5	72.0	64.3	-7.7	78.5	-14.2
Writing (%)	75.0	76.1	72.5	88.8	82.4	73.1	-9.3	88.8	-15.7

= Met or Exceeded State Standard


MC NAIR ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOL

11th Grade HSPT	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	Difference 1999-00 to 2000-01	2000-01 Benchmark	Difference from Benchmark
Reading (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Math (%)	100.0	98.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Writing (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

 = Met or Exceeded State Standard

SNYDER HIGH SCHOOL

11th Grade HSPT	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	Difference 1999-00 to 2000-01	2000-01 Benchmark	Difference from Benchmark
Reading (%)	50.8	47.8	59.8	55.6	43.0	60.9	17.9	64.0	-3.1
Math (%)	43.7	53.8	43.1	51.5	58.0	66.1	8.1	71.5	-5.4
Writing (%)	63.4	61.9	67.8	71.3	74.6	79.5	4.9	85.0	-5.5

 = Met or Exceeded State Standard

APPENDIX B

**Summary Student Performance Indicators:
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (ESPA)**

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (ESPA)

Language Arts Literacy

SCHOOL	Actual May 1999 ¹	Actual May 2000 ²	Actual April 2001 ³	Difference May 2000 to April 2001	2001 Benchmark	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #3	76.8	43.6	67.4	23.8	76.8	-9.4
P.S. #5	57.1	50.0	86.5	36.5	62.5	24.0
P.S. #6	57.1	43.1	67.7	24.6	59.1	8.6
P.S. #8	50.4	31.3	57.4	26.1	51.3	6.1
P.S. #9	30.4	53.3	70.8	17.5	64.2	6.6
P.S. #11	56.6	40.3	78.1	37.8	57.7	20.4
P.S. #12	44.4	24.4	49.0	24.6	44.4	4.6
P.S. #14	17.2	22.2	29.8	7.6	42.2	-12.4
P.S. #15	22.7	12.5	26.1	13.6	32.5	-6.4
P.S. #16	48.1	48.5	79.4	30.9	61.8	17.6
P.S. #17	29.3	32.5	64.2	31.7	52.5	11.7
P.S. #20	33.3	36.2	64.2	28.0	55.6	8.6
P.S. #22	22.4	23.9	44.1	20.2	43.9	0.2
P.S. #23	27.0	30.8	64.2	33.4	50.8	13.4
P.S. #24	39.8	36.0	59.3	23.3	55.5	3.8
P.S. #25	41.3	39.5	75.2	35.7	57.3	17.9
P.S. #27	39.3	41.5	67.0	25.5	58.3	8.7
P.S. #28	45.0	45.7	71.3	25.6	60.4	10.9
P.S. #29	40.4	10.9	38.9	28.0	40.4	-1.5
P.S. #30	31.4	18.2	63.2	45.0	38.2	25.0
P.S. #33	64.7	77.3	81.3	4.0	77.3	4.0
P.S. #34	22.4	24.6	35.8	11.2	44.6	-8.8
P.S. #37	73.8	61.0	84.8	23.8	73.8	11.0
P.S. #38	49.4	28.3	67.9	39.6	49.4	18.5
P.S. #39	19.0	6.7	22.9	16.2	26.7	-3.8
P.S. #41	41.4	19.1	32.9	13.8	41.4	-8.5
P.S. #42	61.3	65.6	71.9	6.3	70.3	1.6
DISTRICT	39.9	34.4	60.0	25.6	54.4	5.6

¹Figures as reported in the *Elementary School Proficiency Assessment State Summary* (Revised January 2001)

²Figures as reported in the *Elementary School Proficiency Assessment State Summary* (January 2001)

³Figures taken from the *Elementary School Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance* (Report Printed 8/06/01)

Note: In 1999, the State Standard was 85 percent passing; in 2000, the State Standard was changed to 75 percent passing. Cells have been highlighted in yellow where the State Standard has been met or exceeded.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (ESPA)

Mathematics

SCHOOL	Actual May 1999 ¹	Actual May 2000 ²	Actual April 2001 ³	Difference May 2000 to April 2001	2001 Benchmark	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #3	81.4	48.7	39.1	-9.6	81.4	-42.3
P.S. #5	64.3	50.0	37.3	-12.7	64.3	-27.0
P.S. #6	68.2	47.1	57.6	10.5	68.2	-10.6
P.S. #8	62.6	58.8	49.2	-9.6	66.9	-17.7
P.S. #9	39.2	62.2	54.1	-8.1	68.6	-14.5
P.S. #11	69.3	65.0	58.9	-6.1	70.0	-11.1
P.S. #12	24.4	31.0	19.2	-11.8	51.0	-31.8
P.S. #14	20.9	37.5	15.8	-21.7	56.3	-40.5
P.S. #15	18.2	19.5	10.7	-8.8	39.5	-28.8
P.S. #16	66.7	66.7	47.0	-19.7	70.9	-23.9
P.S. #17	28.7	26.1	34.3	8.2	46.1	-11.8
P.S. #20	17.7	30.8	30.9	0.1	50.8	-19.9
P.S. #22	35.9	26.8	19.4	-7.4	46.8	-27.4
P.S. #23	31.3	54.2	37.6	-16.6	64.6	-27.0
P.S. #24	26.0	50.6	28.6	-22.0	62.8	-34.2
P.S. #25	40.1	56.8	54.7	-2.1	65.9	-11.2
P.S. #27	45.0	47.5	38.7	-8.8	61.3	-22.6
P.S. #28	46.7	61.0	44.6	-16.4	68.0	-23.4
P.S. #29	39.6	21.8	26.0	4.2	41.8	-15.8
P.S. #30	52.1	34.4	50.0	15.6	54.4	-4.4
P.S. #33	72.1	81.8	66.3	-15.5	81.8	-15.5
P.S. #34	9.3	23.6	18.1	-5.5	43.6	-25.5
P.S. #37	95.4	78.0	84.7	6.7	95.4	-10.7
P.S. #38	53.9	43.4	50.5	7.1	59.2	-8.7
P.S. #39	11.7	20.3	20.4	0.1	40.3	-19.9
P.S. #41	40.4	27.8	6.3	-21.5	47.8	-41.5
P.S. #42	45.1	56.3	46.9	-9.4	65.7	-18.8
DISTRICT	42.4	45.0	38.7	-6.3	60.0	-21.3

¹Figures as reported in the *Elementary School Proficiency Assessment State Summary* (Revised January 2001)

²Figures as reported in the *Elementary School Proficiency Assessment State Summary* (January 2001)

³Figures taken from the *Elementary School Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance* (Report Printed 8/06/01)

Note: In 1999, the State Standard was 85 percent passing; in 2000, the State Standard was changed to 75 percent passing. Cells have been highlighted in yellow where the State Standard has been met or exceeded.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (ESPA)

Science

SCHOOL	Actual May 1999 ¹	Actual May 2000 ²	Actual April 2001 ³	Difference May 2000 to April 2001	2001 Benchmark	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #3	83.7	82.0	69.5	-12.5	83.7	-14.2
P.S. #5	83.4	80.9	84.8	3.9	83.4	1.4
P.S. #6	83.5	81.4	79.8	-1.6	83.5	-3.7
P.S. #8	74.7	76.5	76.0	-0.5	76.5	-0.5
P.S. #9	54.5	80.0	83.3	3.3	80.0	3.3
P.S. #11	84.2	83.1	76.7	-6.4	84.2	-7.5
P.S. #12	53.4	72.1	55.8	-16.3	73.6	-17.8
P.S. #14	42.6	54.0	45.7	-8.3	64.5	-18.8
P.S. #15	40.3	44.7	35.4	-9.3	59.9	-24.5
P.S. #16	92.6	87.9	91.1	3.2	92.6	-1.5
P.S. #17	62.6	60.4	75.2	14.8	67.7	7.5
P.S. #20	56.5	65.7	66.7	1.0	70.4	-3.7
P.S. #22	47.6	49.3	39.7	-9.6	62.2	-22.5
P.S. #23	60.5	75.0	74.6	-0.4	75.0	-0.4
P.S. #24	60.0	72.0	71.1	-0.9	73.5	-2.4
P.S. #25	75.4	79.2	84.6	5.4	79.2	5.4
P.S. #27	72.4	68.7	65.4	-3.3	72.4	-7.0
P.S. #28	83.5	84.9	74.2	-10.7	84.9	-10.7
P.S. #29	51.0	43.5	51.8	8.3	59.3	-7.5
P.S. #30	74.3	65.9	74.7	8.8	74.3	0.4
P.S. #33	91.2	93.9	86.3	-7.6	93.9	-7.6
P.S. #34	41.9	49.2	50.0	0.8	62.1	-12.1
P.S. #37	95.4	88.1	86.4	-1.7	95.4	-9.0
P.S. #38	85.4	69.6	79.8	10.2	85.4	-5.6
P.S. #39	47.5	38.3	34.7	-3.6	56.7	-22.0
P.S. #41	55.0	45.5	35.5	-10.0	60.3	-24.8
P.S. #42	74.2	71.9	71.9	0.0	74.2	-2.3
DISTRICT	66.4	68.7	67.9	-0.8	71.9	-4.0

¹Figures as reported in the *Elementary School Proficiency Assessment State Summary* (Revised January 2001)

²Figures as reported in the *Elementary School Proficiency Assessment State Summary* (January 2001)

³Figures taken from the *Elementary School Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance* (Report Printed 8/06/01)

Note: In 1999, the State Standard was 85 percent passing; in 2000, the State Standard was changed to 75 percent passing. Cells have been highlighted in yellow where the State Standard has been met or exceeded.

APPENDIX C

**Summary Student Performance Indicators:
GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA)**

GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPa)
Language Arts Literacy

SCHOOL	Actual March 1999 ¹	Actual March 2000 ²	Actual March 2001 ³	Difference March 2000 to March 2001	2001 Benchmark	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #3	91.9	89.3	81.8	-7.5	91.9	-10.1
P.S. #5	89.6	90.9	93.5	2.6	90.9	2.6
P.S. #6	93.7	89.4	93.2	3.8	93.7	-0.5
P.S. #8	85.2	80.5	71.8	-8.7	85.2	-13.4
P.S. #9	69.4	70.4	66.7	-3.7	72.7	-6.0
P.S. #11	82.5	73.3	81.4	8.1	82.5	-1.1
P.S. #12	59.1	60.0	63.6	3.6	67.5	-3.9
P.S. #14	61.4	56.0	42.9	-13.1	65.5	-22.6
P.S. #15	54.8	36.7	21.2	-15.5	55.9	-34.7
P.S. #16	87.6	92.0	93.3	1.3	92.0	1.3
P.S. #17	79.0	78.6	69.3	-9.3	79.0	-9.7
P.S. #22	63.2	61.3	48.8	-12.5	68.2	-19.4
P.S. #23	85.6	89.6	81.7	-7.9	89.6	-7.9
P.S. #24	75.3	91.0	93.2	2.2	91.0	2.2
P.S. #25	94.7	96.6	94.6	-2.0	96.6	-2.0
P.S. #27	98.8	92.4	92.2	-0.2	98.8	-6.6
P.S. #28	88.3	88.7	84.0	-4.7	88.7	-4.7
P.S. #34	62.7	61.8	64.4	2.6	68.4	-4.0
P.S. #37	87.2	93.2	83.4	-9.8	93.2	-9.8
P.S. #38	90.1	86.0	76.9	-9.1	90.1	-13.2
P.S. #39	56.1	74.2	82.3	8.1	75.0	7.3
P.S. #40	83.6	76.6	55.3	-21.3	83.6	-28.3
P.S. #41	36.5	46.1	49.4	3.3	60.6	-11.2
Academy I	67.0	57.7	64.8	7.1	67.0	-2.2
Academy II	22.6	27.9	15.0	-12.9	47.9	-32.9
DISTRICT	76.2	74.5	69.9	-4.6	76.2	-6.3

¹Figures as reported in the *Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment State Summary* (December 1999)

²Figures as reported in the *Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment State Summary* (January 2001)

³Figures as reported in the *Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance* (June 8, 2001)

Note: In 1999, the State Standard was 85 percent passing; in 2000, the State Standard was changed to 75 percent passing. Cells have been highlighted in yellow where the State Standard has been met or exceeded.

GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA)

Mathematics

SCHOOL	Actual March 1999 ¹	Actual March 2000 ²	Actual March 2001 ³	Difference March 2000 to March 2001	2001 Benchmark	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #3	37.8	53.6	45.4	-8.2	64.3	-18.9
P.S. #5	72.4	84.8	96.8	12.0	84.8	12.0
P.S. #6	65.3	61.8	83.8	22.0	68.4	15.4
P.S. #8	67.9	54.8	56.5	1.7	67.9	-11.4
P.S. #9	34.3	48.1	36.7	-11.4	61.6	-24.9
P.S. #11	67.5	71.1	79.5	8.4	73.1	6.4
P.S. #12	17.8	14.3	27.3	13.0	34.3	-7.0
P.S. #14	30.2	29.2	21.4	-7.8	49.2	-27.8
P.S. #15	16.7	13.4	16.7	3.3	33.4	-16.7
P.S. #16	62.5	56.0	76.7	20.7	65.5	11.2
P.S. #17	50.6	55.4	58.2	2.8	65.2	-7.0
P.S. #22	22.9	22.6	43.9	21.3	42.6	1.3
P.S. #23	77.3	73.1	85.4	12.3	77.3	8.1
P.S. #24	52.4	55.0	72.7	17.7	65.0	7.7
P.S. #25	64.2	78.0	81.5	3.5	78.0	3.5
P.S. #27	74.0	82.3	74.5	-7.8	82.3	-7.8
P.S. #28	54.4	52.2	60.7	8.5	63.6	-2.9
P.S. #34	35.3	30.9	64.4	33.5	50.9	13.5
P.S. #37	33.3	40.7	76.0	35.3	57.9	18.1
P.S. #38	57.6	56.0	54.8	-1.2	65.5	-10.7
P.S. #39	29.3	43.8	73.5	29.7	59.4	14.1
P.S. #40	41.9	51.2	69.9	18.7	63.1	6.8
P.S. #41	7.0	6.6	12.9	6.3	26.6	-13.7
Academy I	61.0	50.9	61.3	10.4	63.0	-1.7
Academy II	7.3	6.9	9.0	2.1	26.9	-17.9
DISTRICT	48.3	48.4	58.5	10.1	61.7	-3.2

¹Figures as reported in the *Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment State Summary* (December 1999)

²Figures as reported in the *Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment State Summary* (January 2001)

³Figures as reported in the *Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance* (June 8, 2001)

Note: In 1999, the State Standard was 85 percent passing; in 2000, the State Standard was changed to 75 percent passing. Cells have been highlighted in yellow where the State Standard has been met or exceeded.

GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPa)

Science

SCHOOL	Actual March 2000 ¹	Actual March 2001 ²	Difference March 2000 to March 2001	2001 Benchmark	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #3	57.2	39.4	-17.8	66.1	-26.7
P.S. #5	63.6	77.4	13.8	69.3	8.1
P.S. #6	67.1	85.1	18.0	71.1	14.0
P.S. #8	54.8	63.6	8.8	64.9	-1.3
P.S. #9	25.9	50.0	24.1	45.9	4.1
P.S. #11	68.8	70.5	1.7	71.9	-1.4
P.S. #12	25.7	50.0	24.3	45.7	4.3
P.S. #14	43.8	33.3	-10.5	59.4	-26.1
P.S. #15	16.9	15.2	-1.7	36.9	-21.7
P.S. #16	56.0	83.3	27.3	65.5	17.8
P.S. #17	43.4	44.3	0.9	59.2	-14.9
P.S. #22	14.5	48.7	34.2	34.5	14.2
P.S. #23	70.2	63.5	-6.7	72.6	-9.1
P.S. #24	58.0	57.9	-0.1	66.5	-8.6
P.S. #25	80.4	85.9	5.5	80.4	5.5
P.S. #27	74.7	76.7	2.0	75.0	1.7
P.S. #28	50.7	78.2	27.5	62.9	15.3
P.S. #34	23.6	54.2	30.6	43.6	10.6
P.S. #37	49.2	66.7	17.5	62.1	4.6
P.S. #38	67.8	65.9	-1.9	71.4	-5.5
P.S. #39	34.4	55.9	21.5	54.4	1.5
P.S. #40	41.6	53.4	11.8	58.3	-4.9
P.S. #41	19.7	29.4	9.7	39.7	-10.3
Academy I	50.9	60.2	9.3	63.0	-2.8
Academy II	13.7	12.3	-1.4	33.7	-21.4
DISTRICT	48.2	56.9	8.7	61.6	-4.7

¹Figures as reported in the *Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment State Summary* (January 2001)

²Figures as reported in the *Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment Summary of School Performance* (June 8, 2001)

Note: In 2000, the State Standard was 75 percent passing. Cells have been highlighted in yellow where the State Standard has been met or exceeded.